

George W. Pidgeon, Constantine.
 Roy A. McLellan, Coopersville.
 Donald P. Rivard, Daggett.
 Laura J. Diver, Deerfield.
 James Kent Torrey, Dowagiac.
 Frank H. Crowell, East Jordan.
 Regina W. Cleary, Escanaba.
 George C. Du Vall, Fennville.
 Bernard R. Micks, Gladstone.
 Homer Fisher, Grand Haven.
 Frank L. Friend, Harbor Springs.
 Kathleen B. Slattery, Hillman.
 James O. Peet, Ithaca.
 Bert A. Dobson, Jonesville.
 Harry A. Newcomb, Kalamazoo.
 George H. Walters, Laingsburg.
 Paul Doud, Mackinac Island.
 Gerald P. Riley, Mendon.
 Matthew O'Toole, Merrill.
 Alfred C. Maurer, Monroe.
 William A. Seegmiller, Owosso.
 Thomas W. Jackson, Pontiac.
 Neal D. Potter, Quincy.
 Alonzo A. Strong, Reed City.
 Edith B. Kleiber, Rock.
 Arthur C. Cook, Ruth.
 Helen MacMillan, St. Clair Shores.
 Archie G. O'Neal, Saugatuck.
 Adelbert L. Stebbins, Sheridan.
 Lewis L. Peterson, Springport.
 John F. Cross, Three Rivers.
 William Stahl, Van Dyke.
 Morris R. Ehle, Wayland.
 Francis E. Benjamin, Whitehall.
 Robert H. Peacock, Yale.

MISSISSIPPI

Luna C. Davis, Belmont.
 Amos W. Sugg, Jr., Eupora.
 Marguerite C. Johnson, Greenville.
 Isaac M. Jackson, Iuka.
 Roy S. Burroughs, Kosciusko.
 Charles M. Jaco, Winona.

OHIO

Clifton L. D. Hartsel, Ashland.
 Robert C. Young, Bucyrus.
 Herman J. Kightlinger, Caledonia.
 Earl L. Heck, Englewood.
 William V. Goshorn, Galion.
 Clare Trent, Leesburg.
 Clyde L. Weiser, Orrville.
 Emmett Lewis, Osborn.
 Harry C. Stratton, Piney Fork.
 Orion W. Kerschner, Trotwood.
 George W. Kinzey, Wayne.

TENNESSEE

John W. Nicholson, Ashland City.
 Elbert D. Corlew, Charlotte.
 John S. McBride, Covington.
 Harry B. Cunningham, Ethridge.
 Thaddeus C. Haley, Friendship.
 George A. McAdams, Greenfield.
 William W. Turner, Jasper.
 Monie Orth, Loretto.
 Allen N. Williams, Newbern.
 Robert W. Simmons, Sr., Sharon.

TEXAS

Maggie P. Rhew, Anderson.
 Ernest F. Percy, Bastrop.
 Olive P. Jordan, Beckville.
 Charlie B. O'Bryan, De Berry.
 Jesse J. Newman, Denver City.
 Oscar S. Cousins, Devers.
 Andrew F. Hester, Donna.
 Arthur B. Hobbs, Edgewood.

Addison Lysander Lincecum, El Campo.
 John Richard Folkes, Giddings.
 Samuel G. Hampton, Goree.
 John C. Clayton, Kerens.
 Crown Dickson, Kilgore.
 Carl Little, Ladonia.
 James S. Colley, Legion.
 Rufus R. Eddins, Marlin.
 W. J. Smith, Montgomery.
 Thomas C. Murray, Sonora.
 William R. Baker, Strawn.
 William A. Trotman, Trinidad.
 Oliver Lee Lowry, Valley View.
 Clara M. Bean, Van Horn.
 Mary Foster, Waelder.
 Rudolph J. Marak, West.
 Chester L. Lewis, Wheeler.

WEST VIRGINIA

Rufus L. Keel, Coalwood.
 Harper H. Hudson, Durbin.
 Arling C. McGe, Elkins.
 Patrick J. Burke, McMechen.
 Claude E. Mills, Newell.
 George A. Brooks, Pineville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 23, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee that Thou art patient and willing to hear our prayer. Awaken in us a strong sense of those mercies with which Thou art blessing our beloved country. Because of Thy wonderful providence we are achieving the great tasks of our national life. We earnestly pray for our President, our Speaker, and the Congress. Grant that the spirit of Jehovah may rest upon them; the spirit of wisdom and understanding; the spirit of counsel and might; the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord. Let Thy blessings be upon the youth of our land. May they grow up to all truth, to fidelity, to industry, to temperance in all things, to purity of thought and feeling, to reverence our Republic, and to a belief in God our Father and in His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. May they know the wealth and the commonwealth of Thy heart. O Thou who dost fulfill world-old dreams and hopes, let woven calms smite the breaking strings of the world's heart. Humanity is passing through a travail of tears and death; it is between two worlds, one dying and the other struggling to be born. Grant, Almighty One, that the cry of world dominion or death may soon be changed to God dominion and life. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9209. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9243. An act to provide for the promotion of promotion-list officers of the Army after specified years of service in grade, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 229. An act to authorize the withdrawal of national-forest lands for the protection of watersheds from which water is obtained for municipalities, and for other purposes;

S. 255. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the Port of Cascade Locks, Oreg., certain lands for municipal purposes;

S. 1214. An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes;

S. 3402. An act to authorize the granting of a right-of-way for roadway purposes on the Fort Thomas Military Reservation, Ky., in exchange for the release of property rights in and to a certain road on said reservation; and

S. 3423. An act to increase the number of brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army by four.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. V

Mr. COCHRAN, from the Select Committee on Government Organization, submitted the following privileged joint resolution (H. J. Res. 551) providing for the taking effect of Reorganization Plan No. V, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed:

House Joint Resolution 551

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. V, submitted to the Congress on May 22, 1940, shall take effect on the tenth day after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

Sec. 2. Nothing in such plan or this joint resolution shall be construed as having the effect of continuing any agency or function beyond the time when it would have terminated without regard to such plan or this joint resolution or of continuing any function beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested would have terminated without regard to such plan or this joint resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the report I have just submitted is a privileged report, unanimously reported by the committee. I ask unanimous consent that when it is called up for consideration debate be limited to 1 hour, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE RELIEF BILL

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I shall offer an amendment to section 10 (a) of the pending relief appropriation bill for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1940 (H. J. Res. 544), to increase the limit of total allocations to Federal projects from \$20,000,000 to \$60,000,000. This latter figure is the amount for Federal projects in the appropriation act for the present fiscal year.

The purpose of the pending appropriation bill for work relief and relief is to furnish employment to those employable persons who are out of work and who are in dire need of work in order to live. It is not a "pork barrel" or a means of promoting any of our individual pet projects. Therefore, I heartily approve and am supporting the action of the Appropriations Committee and of the leadership of the House in resisting any efforts to earmark funds for any individual projects.

But it is well to keep constantly in mind that this is Federal money and that if the same number of unemployed can be put to work on necessary and useful projects which are being carried on by regular Federal agencies we can to that extent reduce the necessity for Federal appropriations in the future.

This is particularly true of projects which are now under way at those Army and Navy stations which are near the large centers of population where the density of unemployment is greatest. If, in such localities, we can furnish em-

ployment to the needy unemployed and can also promote preparation for national defense, we shall be accomplishing a double purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PROMOTION-LIST OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9243) to provide for the promotion of promotion-list officers of the Army after specified years of service in grade, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, HARTER of Ohio, FADDIS, ARENDS, MARTIN of Iowa, and ELSTON.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, the so-called national-defense bill which has been reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs, and which, I understand, will follow the relief bill, contains a provision that the employment of any additional personnel shall be without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law relating thereto.

I just want to give notice that when this bill comes up for consideration I shall offer an amendment to strike out that language, because I believe it ought to be stricken, and also because General Gasser, Deputy Chief of Staff, testifying before the committee said that it was his opinion and request, as well as that of the Secretary of War and the War Department and also the Civil Service Commission, that that language should be deleted. At the proper time I shall offer you my reasons for the support of the amendment I propose to offer. I am the friend of civil service. More than that I am for national defense. Politics and logrolling to get jobs should be adjourned. Merit and patriotism should be the test.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point to include a letter I have received on the subject from Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, one of the Commissioners of the United States Civil Service Commission, explaining the attitude of the War Department and the Civil Service Commission. These two great branches of the Government are in complete accord and we should back them up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1940.

Hon. R. E. THOMASON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMASON: I appreciated very much your telephone call relative to the exemption from civil service that has been made a part of the War Department bill dealing with the national-defense program as reported by the Military Affairs Committee to the House of Representatives.

In the first place, the Civil Service Commission is in complete agreement with the War Department and with the members of the Military Affairs Committee that in recruiting civilian personnel in an emergency such as this country faces at the present time speed should be and must be the primary consideration.

The Commission does not believe, however, that the exemption from civil service which has been incorporated in the bill as reported by the Military Affairs Committee is necessary in order to achieve this objective.

Our reason for this belief is that the President of the United States already has complete authority to exempt positions from the competitive or any other provisions of the Civil Service Act. This authority is contained, first of all, in section 1753 of the Revised Statutes as enacted on March 3, 1871. This section reads as follows:

"Revised Statutes, section 1753: The President is authorized to prescribe such regulations for the admission of persons into the civil service of the United States as may best promote the efficiency thereof, and ascertain the fitness of each candidate in respect to age,

health, character, knowledge, and ability for the branch of service into which he seeks to enter; and for this purpose he may employ suitable persons to conduct such inquiries, and may prescribe their duties, and establish regulations for the conduct of persons who may receive appointments in the civil service (16 Stat. 514, Mar. 3, 1871; 5 U. S. C. 631)."

In the second place, section 2 of the Civil Service Act provides, "And among other things said rules shall provide and declare as nearly as the conditions of good administration will warrant."

Acting in pursuance of this authority, the President, on September 21, 1939, issued Executive Order No. 8257, which reads as follows:

"By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by the provisions of paragraph 8 of subdivision 2 of section 2 of the Civil Service Act (22 Stat. 403, 404), it is hereby ordered that, subject to appropriate noncompetitive tests of fitness, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to permit an immediate appointment without regard to the competitive requirements of the Civil Service Rules in any case in which it appears that a public exigency exists which is directly connected with the neutrality of the United States or the preparedness program of the Federal Government. This authority may be used only under most unusual and compelling circumstances, and the person or persons so appointed will not thereby acquire a classified civil-service status."

In conformity with this order, whenever the Commission is not able to provide immediately eligibles from its competitive registers, it will proceed to provide the War Department with qualified persons under the terms of the Executive order. If any further exemptions are necessary in connection with any particular types of positions, the President has the authority to make those exemptions.

Furthermore, the Commission now has the power, whenever it is unable to take care of the needs of the War Department, to authorize the Department to do anything that it can to find persons for its own positions. The Commission will not hesitate to exercise this power whenever it is necessary to do so.

The Civil Service Commission has gone very thoroughly and carefully into this whole problem with the War Department. It has explained to the Department the extent of our present resources, and it has also indicated to the Department that when it is unable to render prompt service that it will not stand in the way of the Department's taking whatever steps may be necessary to expedite its program.

On the basis of these conversations, the War Department has arrived at the conclusion that its own time, energy, and money can be conserved, and at the same time that it can obtain better service, if the recruiting responsibility in connection with its program rests with the Civil Service Commission. Under the circumstances, it would seem to be very unfortunate for the Congress to hamper the War Department in its national-defense program by putting the Department in a situation where it would have to open up civilian recruiting offices of its own and where it would be subject to all kinds of pressures in the interest of particular individuals obtaining jobs. This would seem to be particularly unfortunate when, over a period of 50 years, the United States Government has made a tremendous investment in the Civil Service Commission as the central recruiting agency and when the Commission is in a better position than ever before in its history to render the kind of service to the War and Navy Departments which should be rendered in a time such as this.

All of the worth-while objectives which might be accomplished through placing an exemption in the bill such as the one proposed can be accomplished without such an exemption by reason of the authority now resting in the President of the United States. At the same time all of the unworthy objectives which many persons would attempt to realize once such an exemption is placed in the bill can be avoided by utilizing the recruiting machinery of the Civil Service Commission, with its central office, its 13 district offices, and its 5,000 local boards.

The Civil Service Commission appreciates the importance of making careful character investigations of persons who are appointed to civilian positions in connection with the national-defense program. In this connection, the Commission hopes that its own resources for making these investigations will be enlarged, and at the same time it has reason to know that it will obtain the cooperation of other law-enforcement agencies in making these investigations. The Commission is in a position to prevent sabotage, and it will do everything within its power to discharge this responsibility in the proper manner.

At a time when the whole Nation is thinking in terms of putting its defense agencies on an emergency basis, there is no reason why the agency which has primary responsibility for the recruiting of civilian personnel cannot be placed on a similar basis; and certainly there is no reason whatsoever for asking the War Department to start building up a recruiting machinery which it does not have at the present time and which it could not possibly obtain without diverting funds which should be spent on the national-defense program.

If I can provide you with any additional information on this matter, I shall be delighted to do so. Thank you for asking me to write you relative to what the Commission believes to be a very important matter in connection with the desire of everyone to "adjourn politics in the interest of national defense."

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Commissioner.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, whose function it is to prepare and edit the Codes of Laws of the United States and of the District of Columbia, I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] for the interest manifested by him in the District of Columbia Code, as shown by his remarks extended in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 9860. It is gratifying to realize that the Members are accepting the invitation of the committee—which I have on several occasions voiced on this floor and which is contained in the preface to the annual supplements of both codes—to offer any suggestions or criticisms which they may have or which may be brought to their attention, with a view that the codes may be made as complete and as nearly perfect in all respects as is possible.

The Committee on Revision of the Laws is presently engaged in the preparation of a new edition of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, which, it is hoped, will contain all the laws, general and permanent in their nature, relating to or in force in the District of Columbia, except such laws as are of application in the District of Columbia by reason of being laws of the United States, general and permanent in their nature.

In connection with the preparation of such new edition a complete and detailed survey is being made of all the laws enacted since the enactment of the 1901 Code of the District of Columbia, so that any omission from the 1929 edition of the code may be discovered and all such laws which should properly be a part of the code will be included.

May I say, in passing, that all the statutes contained in the list submitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] have, among numerous others, been the subject of study by us for some time and it is our intention to include each and every act coming to our attention, either as a result of our own survey or suggestion by others, which properly belongs in the Code of the District of Columbia.

Without expressing an opinion at this time concerning the desirability of including in the District of Columbia Code those statutes listed by the gentleman, inasmuch as these very statutes are still being considered by us along with many others, I should like to point out that the Code of the District of Columbia is confined and limited by law to those laws—

Relating to or in force in the District of Columbia, except such laws as are of application in the District of Columbia by reason of being laws of the United States general and permanent in their nature.

May I again express the thanks of the committee to the gentleman and renew our solicitation of suggestions or criticisms relating to both the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code. I urge the gentleman and the other Members not to hesitate to make any suggestions merely because they feel that our own survey will discover what they have in mind. We would greatly prefer to have many duplications of suggestions or criticisms than to omit a single statute that should be included or to leave unrectified a single error existing in the current edition of the code. It is only by such helpful interest on the part of the Members and other users of the codes that that degree of perfection which is our aim can be attained.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a paragraph from Mrs. Roosevelt's column.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. Fleming, Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, to Mr. J. S. Capper, president of the Toro Manufacturing Co., of Minneapolis, Minn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from this morning's New York Times relating to the influx of Germans into Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter on the Bituminous Coal Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent interview in the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short letter and a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. V

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the President's order transferring the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization to the Department of Justice. I am opposed to this order on the following grounds:

First. It will cover up and protect Mme. Perkins' mismanagement of this Bureau and the fact that she has coddled, sympathized with, and protected these so-called "fifth-column agents" that the President is becoming worried about.

Second. The results desired by the President can be much more quickly and effectively secured by demanding the resignation of Mme. Perkins and appointing a competent administrator in her place.

Third. The transfer would disrupt and throw into turmoil some 3,000 well-trained high-grade employees of the Bureau by dumping them willy-nilly into a new Department not organized for that particular work at a time when we need and must have effective action.

Read my extension of remarks for further light on this matter.

NATIONAL AVIATION FORUM

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great importance and interest in the development of aviation, I want to call attention to one of the great events relating to the progress of aviation which will take place in Washington next week.

The great National Aviation Forum will again be held in Washington May 26 to May 29, inclusive. Hundreds of private planes will converge on Washington to participate in this forum. There will be more than 350 private planes taking part.

There will be activities, displays, lectures, and demonstrations all during this period at Bolling Field, at the auditorium of the Department of Commerce, at the auditorium of the Department of Labor, and in the sky itself.

The opening day, Sunday, May 26, has been designated as Model Exhibition Day. Exhibits at Bolling Field that day will be opened with appropriate ceremonies. The aeronautical exhibit at Bolling Field will be open to the public from 3 p. m. to 11 p. m. The most comprehensive exhibition of aviation history will be on display, with exhibits from the Army, the Navy, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Post Office Department, the Weather Bureau, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the W. P. A., the Office of Education, the Air Transport Association, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, the air lines, and the leading manufacturers of airplanes and accessories in the aviation industry. There will also be model-plane contests. At the Department of Commerce Auditorium there will be talks on the latest phases of aviation by leading figures of the industry representing all of the Americas. At the Department of Labor Auditorium there will be free motion pictures covering the drama and development of flight from Icarus to the flying fortresses. These will be open from noon to 5 p. m. and from 6 p. m. to 9 p. m.

In the sky will be a great cavalcade of private flyers from all parts of the country, the giant new Boeing stratoliner just unveiled this month by T. W. A., a parade of naval and commercial blimps, and demonstrations and formation flying exhibitions.

Exhibits will also be available to the public in the Department of Commerce lobby and in the various hotels.

Transportation to Bolling Field will be available by busses at regular intervals.

The program for the 3 days in addition to the first day as Model Exhibition Day will be as follows: Monday, May 27, Private Flyers' Day; Tuesday, May 28, Air Line Day; Wednesday, May 29, National Defense Day. There will also be demonstrations on the final day by military and naval units and demonstrations of the operation of an antiaircraft unit by the District of Columbia Guard.

The forum will be climaxed by a "dinner aloft" banquet, attended by 1,100 prominent guests, in the ballroom of the Willard Hotel.

This Aviation Forum, started last year, is becoming a great factor in the development and coordination of all phases of aviation in the United States, and is making a most valuable contribution to the progress of private, commercial, and military aviation.

The detailed program for the forum at the Department of Commerce is:

Monday, May 27, 1940

MORNING SESSION

1. Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, District of Columbia Commission, American Aviation Moves Forward. (Greetings to the forum.)
2. Ruth Nichols, Rye, N. Y., Woman's Place in Aviation.
3. J. B. Hartnaff, Jr., executive secretary, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, Flying Clubs and Group Flights.
4. Oliver Parks, president of Parks Air College, East St. Louis, Ill., How You Can Get Into Aviation.
5. Helena Mroczkowska, of Hofstra College, What the Civilian Pilot Training Program Has Meant to Me.
6. Mrs. Louise Thaden, veteran woman pilot, The Ninety-nines and the Future of Women in Aviation.
7. Dr. Edward C. Elliott, president, Purdue University, Civilian Flight Training in National Service.
8. Gordon M. Curtis, president, Aviation Funding Corporation, How to Buy Airplanes.
9. Haven B. Page, Washington representative of the Private Flyers Association, A New Status for Private Pilots.
10. Grove Webster, chief, Private Flying Development Division, C. A. A., As We See It.
11. William B. Stout, president of Stout Laboratories, Inc., Flivvers of the Future.

AFTERNOON SESSION

1. W. W. Brinckerhoff, secretary, Private Fliers Association, The Insurance Status.

2. Rudolph Loening, president, Seaplane Flying Association, What the Seaplane Offers.
3. Fred E. Weick, chief engineer, Engineering and Research Corporation, Simpler Flying.
4. C. G. Taylor, president, Taylorcraft Aircraft Corporation, The Light Plane.
5. Arlene Davis, Cleveland, Private Flying as I See It.
6. Alfred L. Wolf, secretary, Association of Aircraft Owners and Pilots, What Are You Waiting For?
7. A. I. Martin, Watkins Glen, N. Y., Ox Team to Airplane.
8. Alfred Brokaw Bennett, Hightstown, N. J., Merchandising Light Planes for Defense.
9. Hon. Robert M. Hinckley, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, Nonscheduled Civil Aviation and Government.

Tuesday, May 28, 1940

MORNING SESSION

1. Capt. Robert Dawson, United Air Lines, What Are We Going To Do About the Weather?
2. Al Near, Bowman Field, Louisville, Ky., the Importance of Aviation in the Small Town.
3. Roger M. Combs, Jr., New York, Why It Pays To Fly.
4. Norman Bel Geddes, New York, Tomorrow's Airways.
5. Mrs. Ogden Reid, New York, Air Transport From the Passenger's Viewpoint.
6. Charles A. Rheinstrom, American Airlines, When the War Is Over, Then What?
7. F. W. Reichelderfer, Weather Bureau, Department of Agriculture, International Character of Airways Weather Service.
8. Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, Air Transport Association, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and Reorganization Act of 1940.
9. Grover Leening, New York, Cargo by Air in War or Peace.

AFTERNOON SESSION

1. Maj. R. W. Schroeder, United Airlines, Behind the Scenes of Safe Air Transportation.
2. Devon Francis, Associated Press, News Is Where You Find It.
3. Richard duPont, All American Aviation, Inc., Feeder Lines.
4. Dr. Alfred N. Goldsmith, New York, Radio and Aviation.
5. Kinsey N. Merritt, Railway Express Agency, Progress in Air Express.
6. Roscoe Turner, Indianapolis.
7. H. M. Bixby, Pan American Airways.
8. T. B. Wilson, T. W. A., Public Relations in Air Transport.

SPECIAL FEATURE

Lowell Thomas, broadcasting on the subject of the forum at 5:45 p. m.

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

MORNING SESSION

1. Gill Robb Wilson, National Aeronautic Association, Forecast of the Flying Forties.
2. Ralph McClarren, Franklin Institute, An Action Story of Aviation.
3. Charles H. Babb, Los Angeles, Air Freight.
4. Ernest R. Breech, General Motors Corporation, Outlook for Civil Aviation.
5. Rear Admiral R. R. Waesche, United States Coast Guard, Aviation in the Coast Guard.
6. Zack Mosely, New York, Aviation in the Comics.
7. Dr. Vannevar Bush, National Advisory Council for Aeronautics, Aeronautical Research: A Vital Link in Our National Defense.
8. Col. John H. Jouett, Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, Industry's Position in Accelerated National Defense.

AFTERNOON SESSION

1. C. S. (Casey) Jones, Newark, N. J., South American Sidelights on National Defense.
2. Capt. A. L. Patterson, New York, Flying in China and Its Lesson to Us.
3. Rear Admiral J. H. Towers, United States Navy.
4. Harold Montee, Aero Insurance Underwriters, Insurance and Its Part in the Development of Aviation.
5. Commander C. E. Rosendahl, United States Navy, The Case for the Airship Today.
6. Jacqueline Cochran, New York, Women in Air Defense.
7. Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, United States Army, The Army Air Corps.
8. Hon. F. H. LaGuardia, New York, Let's Tell the Truth.

In addition to the two main features of the Forum and its exhibition, thousands of visitors and residents of Washington will have an opportunity to see many of the following features in the realm of aviation:

One hundred and eight Army planes taking part in maneuvers over the city.

Approximately 500 private planes flying in cavalcade.

Films depicting the development and drama of aviation, free to the public, in the Department of Labor auditorium, noon to 5 p. m., and 6 p. m. to 9 p. m.

Lowell Thomas broadcast Tuesday, 5:45 p. m.

American Forum of the Air, Sunday night, May 26, Mutual, coast-to-coast.

Winthrop Rockefeller and T. H. Beck will speak on Air Youth of America, Monday, 6 p. m., N. B. C.

Postmaster General Farley is, among others, on the banquet program, Wednesday, 10 p. m.

Model flying on Sunday at Bolling Field from 3 to 6 p. m.

A Pan American clipper ship in the Potomac River.

Pan American also will have a DC-3 Douglas, of the latest type, on exhibition.

The air-mail-stamp collection of the President of the United States on display in the Department of Commerce.

Exhibits by the Patent Office and Library of Congress, in addition to those of 12 Government agencies already announced.

An aviation fashion show, with beautiful models, at the Raleigh Hotel, Saturday at 1 p. m.

Visits especially arranged for Forum guests to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Formation flying by Navy blimps from Lakehurst, N. J.

The stratoliner, recently acquired by Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., is flying in for the show.

Maj. Roscoe Turner will exhibit his Thompson record-holding racer, arriving at Bolling Field about 11 a. m., Monday, May 27.

Jacqueline Cochran, famous woman flyer, has promised to show her Seversky (Republic) pursuit plane in which she set recent international records.

Forty members of the Aviation Writers Association are coming to Washington and will make the Forum the occasion of their annual convention.

I want to invite all the Members of Congress to take advantage of this great forum and to participate as extensively as possible in the forum activities.

COALITION IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal today about coalition. The President has invited prominent Republicans to come to Washington and to the White House to make preparations for war. Preparations for what war? Who wants to get into a war? Is it possible that this Congress or this Nation is going to permit our country to get into any kind of war where we will have to send our boys across the sea? God forbid that that time should ever come, and I say to the Republicans, let us have no coalition for war of any kind or whereby we are going to put the President back in the White House for a third term. Nothing would be more disastrous to America, America's civilization or to American form of life, or to American liberty. God forbid that that time should ever come. We want no dictatorship here in America, and that is what war coalition or third-term coalition means. We want none of it. We will all get together when America is in danger of aggression by any foe. We will know no party, we will have no foreign entanglements, we will be one for America, for American tradition, American freedom, and the American flag.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] who just preceded me, I wish to present my compliments to the House and to say that as a Democrat I also hope we shall have no coalition Cabinet. The Democratic Party is in control of the Government of this Nation, and I hope and trust they have the courage to accept the responsibility of it. I, for one who is well acquainted with our present Secretary of War, am sure he is a man as well qualified for this position as is any man

in this Nation and, I feel sure, enjoys the full confidence of the Congress. [Applause.]

There is another thing that I want to say to the gentleman. Nobody in this Nation wants war, but neither did Holland, Norway, nor Belgium want war. They were not going to war, but war was brought to them with all of its horror of death and destruction. All their determination to keep out of war availed them nothing in the face of the crisis. In such a time as this we must depend upon factors more tangible than mere wishes to insure the security of this Nation. [Applause.]

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to insert in the RECORD a short letter from a member of the Kansas Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, again I want to direct the attention of the House and the country to the continued efforts to discredit Col. Charles A. Lindbergh merely because he has advised the country to know what it is doing before billions are wasted in abortive efforts at national defense. It has become a habit with the new dealers to take the position that no one has the right to go on the air who happens to disagree with the autocrat in the White House. Colonel Lindbergh advised against hysteria, which was the sanest thing that has been said in all the jumble of bunk that has been peddled on the air about the dire danger of invasion of this country. If we get into this war it will be on a wild wave of hysteria and hysterical chatter about dangers that do not exist.

Colonel Lindbergh would have been most useful as a technician and adviser on air defense. He is an expert without competition and not merely a flyer of intrepid courage. But the new dealers will not use him because he is no "yes" man—no "rubber stamp." I am heartily in favor of President Roosevelt on preparedness, but I would like to know more of what became of the seven billions we have already spent during his administration and yet we are led to believe we are naked to our enemies. I do not have to change my attitude, for in 1939 I was the only one from my State who voted for the air program, but I want it done by those who know their job. Colonel Lindbergh is one who does know and for that reason he will not be used by this New Deal administration. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter from Hon. O. P. May, a member of the Kansas Legislature and an eminent lawyer of the Kansas bar, upon this subject:

ATCHISON, KANS., May 21, 1940.

Hon. U. S. GUYER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GUYER: Colonel Lindbergh has expressed my sentiments exactly on this war situation.

We should, under no circumstances, send troops to Europe. We have no business in these European troubles. No other country in the Western Hemisphere is trying to intermeddle and neither should we.

In the World War, Russia and Italy were allied with the Allies. In this war they are allied with Germany. In the World War Turkey was allied with Germany, but in this war Turkey is allied with France and England. Why should we mess in such a tangled situation of European politics as that?

I am for preparedness, but for defense against invasion of the Western Hemisphere only, but such an eventuality is not likely at least for another generation. In other words, even if Germany should conquer France and England, she will be so exhausted that it will be another generation before she could even think of invading the Western Hemisphere. I am out of patience with this hysteria mongering, which is the next thing to war mongering, coming from high places.

Yours very sincerely,

O. P. MAY,
Commander, Fleming-Jackson-Seever Post,
No. 6, the American Legion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Louis Johnson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert some excerpts from speeches and reports of a brief character.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article on industrial sabotage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram from the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Boake Carter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DICTATORSHIP

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WHY DESERT?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my remarks are addressed to the Republicans of the House. Many of us in the past have charged the present administration with being wasteful, extravagant, incompetent, and with having failed in some instances to prevent the use of money appropriated for relief for political purposes.

A week ago today, in this Chamber, the President told us, in substance, that we were not secure from foreign invasion; that our Nation was wholly unprepared to meet such an emergency; that we were confronted with a great and imminent danger; that it was necessary for us to at once embark upon a program of national defense which would require the expenditure of billions of dollars, tax our ability, and our resources.

Our charge that the administration has been wasteful, extravagant, and lacking in ability to solve even our domestic problems is more than justified by the record. If we were sincere in making those charges, and we know the record substantiates them, should we now, as representatives of the people, desert our post of duty here in Washington; go home to mend political fences, promote our own reelection, and leave the President, whose adherents in high Federal positions are now insisting that he be elected for a third term, not only in a position where he and they can use the program for national defense to further his political interests but where he and those whose political positions depend upon his continuance in office can use the emergency to establish a dictatorship here in America?

As the people's representatives we have a duty to perform. If, in ordinary times, our duty requires our presence here in Washington, how much more essential is it that, in these days when dictators abroad are carrying on their war of destruction, we, the people's representatives, should remain faithful to our trust and refuse to adjourn until we have

made an effort to solve the domestic problems which confront us; until this Nation is adequately prepared to meet all enemies, whether they come from without or from within.

Let us keep faith by remaining on duty, true to the confidence reposed in us. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

COALITION GOVERNMENT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by including an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the reckless expenditure of money by this administration. I am opposed to the third-term idea or a coalition of these two great parties. I cannot understand why, after the President refused to cooperate with former President Hoover when we had a banking calamity, he now wants the Republican leaders to cooperate with him and so get them into a jam, when he thinks there are war clouds over the country. I cannot understand the procedure of that gentleman in the White House. I believe in adequate national defense, but I think 50,000 planes sounds foolish. The President should also tell us where to get the money. The President should not be given a blank check for \$200,000,000. This is wasteful and dangerous.

AMENDMENTS TO THE HATCH ACT

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House that I have been besieged by letters of inquiry from every State in the Union as to when the amendments to the Hatch Act will be brought to the floor. These letters, to say the least, have been most critical in condemning the delay in bringing up this legislation.

I have sought on the basis of information which I deemed to be reliable to advise my correspondents, and, in fact, the public in general, that I believed the Committee on the Judiciary would report it out shortly. After 2 months have elapsed and the committee has failed, despite semiweekly meetings, to take any positive action, I can no longer honestly and conscientiously state that as my belief.

It must be apparent, Mr. Speaker, to the great majority of the Members of the House—just as it is apparent to the people of this country—that failure to bring this legislation to the floor is prompted largely by the instinct of fear—fear that when this measure eventually comes up for action it will be passed. I can assure you this fear is well-founded. Recent developments have served to focus the attention of the entire Nation on these amendments, and the demand by the public for the passage of this legislation has grown apace. I do not believe the membership of this body is desirous of permitting obstructionist tactics any longer. I believe the great majority of this membership is sincere in support of this legislation and agrees with me that it should be brought up for full consideration in this session of the Congress.

If the incentive to prevent action on the amendments to the Hatch Act is based upon political expediency, as has been frequently charged, I would like to point out that from the purely political viewpoint it is extremely hazardous for any group of Members of the House of Representatives to take such action as will bring down upon it further condemnation by a public which is, putting it mildly, in a most uncertain political temper at this time.

There is a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk, the purpose of which is to bring this legislation before the House. The eyes of the public are upon the signatures appended to that petition and it is being considered a veritable roll of honor of names of Members of Congress who stand for honesty and decency in politics.

So that this entire House may not be held responsible for sabotage of this worthy legislation, I urge the membership to sign this petition immediately, because I feel that is the surest way in which this measure will be brought up for full consideration, and one way in which the people of this Nation will have a fitting reply to the charges that are being made through the press and over the radio that the House of Representatives does not have the courage to go on record for or against the bill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY], for whom I have a very high regard, is sponsoring a piece of legislation that is more far reaching than even he suspects. The Committee on the Judiciary has been very carefully considering the matter and is very carefully considering all of the aspects of this legislation now, and let me say to you Members of the House that had the gentleman from New Mexico given full consideration to all of the effects of this bill he would not have urged that the House, without considering its effects, sign the roll that he is erroneously, in my judgment, describing as an honor roll.

CRITICISM OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and at the same time I ask unanimous consent to insert a portion of an article from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am not a bit surprised at the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], but I am at the extent that he so freely admits he has been criticizing and criticizing and attacking the administration. He omits to say, however, that he has been doing so unfairly and unjustly. This administration and each and every member of it can be proud of its achievements, and I compare this administration with the administration of Mr. Harding or Mr. Hoover at any time. Some of you gentlemen are willing to stand here and make unfair charges and political bunk speeches to the country, but they will not help you in any way.

I know you do not care for my advice, as you have so frequently disregarded it, but if I could advise you, because some of you mean well, I would advise you to change your tactics and cooperate with us on the constructive and needed legislation that is before us instead of wasting your breath, killing time, and delaying this legislation, because tomorrow we will take up the military and on Saturday the great naval-defense bills.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman in favor of a dictatorship?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no, and the gentleman knows better than that.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], as well as other Members of the House, have again, as is their daily custom, seen fit to criticize President Roosevelt and the administration and once more have harangued us with their old threadbare cry of inefficiency. As I suggested before, I presume they prefer the kind of efficiency we had under Harding and Hoover.

Personally I do not object to honest criticism. But to willfully continue these attacks with accusations not based on facts is most deplorable. I feel especially keen about it at this time, because as everyone knows we are passing through a great crisis, and it is no time for anyone to be attempting to assail, attack, and try to embarrass the President.

Several gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle oppose the idea of a coalition Cabinet. So do I. And so does the country, for it has complete confidence in our great President and his Cabinet.

Having served under seven Presidents and, therefore, under seven different Cabinets, I am satisfied that the present

Cabinet has demonstrated and proven itself to be more efficient than any other. It is true that one Cabinet member—Mrs. Perkins, Secretary of Labor—has been continuously assailed, and not because of inefficiency, by vicious vested-interest publicists. I recognize that some of our great industrialists, in spite of the fact they are making more money than ever, do not like our efficient and respected Secretary of Labor. This is easily understandable. It is because they cannot control her; it is because she stands for justice and fair play for the workers. This is something that large employers like President Tom Girdler, of Republic Steel, and Ernest T. Weir, of the Weirton Steel Co., the "dough" man and treasurer of the Republican National Committee, the two outstanding labor-oppressing steel corporations of the United States; William S. Knudsen, president of General Motors, and others of their ilk, just cannot seem to understand. Nor are Franklin D. Roosevelt's policies to their liking. Their first choice, if they could only put him across, would be Wendell L. Willkie, one of the bright boys of the House of Morgan, and now official spokesman for the Power Trust. Or possibly they would accept Herbert Hoover, Frank Gannett, the rich back-actionary newspaper publisher; the prosecuting attorney, Thomas E. Dewey, of New York; or the boy Senator, Taft, of Ohio, son of William Howard Taft, whom Teddy Roosevelt made President and was later obliged to repudiate. The fact that the big moguls of American finance and industry prefer one of these birds to Franklin D. Roosevelt is illuminating because it shows just how much sense—or how little—they really possess. The people want F. D. R. to remain in the White House, and they will not accept anyone in his stead, least of all any Republican.

Many of the Republican Members of the House would like Congress to remain in session indefinitely, and thus be able to use this floor as a sounding board for their bunkerino attacks on the administration. But the people rightfully have the fullest and most complete confidence in Franklin D. Roosevelt. Not a few newspapers that once assailed the President now recognize his resourcefulness, sagacity, level-headedness, and ability, and want him to remain at the helm while the Nation is passing through perhaps the greatest crisis of its history.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time to fling unjustified criticism at the President or the Government—no time to rock the boat—and especially for purely partisan purposes. In this connection, to show the unfairness of some of the President's severest critics, I am asking permission to extend my remarks for the purpose of reproducing extracts from two articles on preparedness from the pages of my great admirer, the Chicago Tribune.

I am giving this recognition to the Tribune because on May 13 it published an editorial in large type on the first page attacking the administration and declaring the Nation had nothing "tangible" to show in the way of preparedness for the huge sums expended for that purpose, and that "each day finds us falling further behind."

The Tribune, "my friend," then proceeded to have one of their star investigators, Mr. Walter Trohan, make a thorough examination of the state of our preparedness, and he did. Well, he reported that the United States has the largest and best Navy in the world, and proved it. He reported that the Navy high command is satisfied that it can defeat any fleet afloat, and thus exercise its function of bringing an enemy to terms at a safe distance from American shores. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in all fairness the largest Navy in the world—and it wasn't the largest under any President in our history but Franklin Roosevelt—is something definitely "tangible."

But what I am wondering is how Mr. Trohan's articles ever "got by" the Tribune editorial desk, for it puts the lie to nearly every important representation set forth in the Tribune editorial of a week previous.

In view of the fact that there is a mad man running loose in Europe today, and no one knows what he may attempt next, I realize we must greatly increase our state of preparedness. But the President realizes it, too, and already has asked Congress for big increases for both the Army

and the Navy and especially for aviation. This to keep us out and not to put us in the war—as falsely charged by you Republicans.

I well remember that when the President in a speech in Chicago 2 years ago pointed out the need of increased preparedness he was criticized in many quarters. When he said the same thing just a few months ago it was charged that he was trying to put us in war. Nothing was further from his mind. He was simply trying to do his duty to see that we were so prepared as to be able to meet every possible emergency. He has been building up and strengthening our defenses every year that he has been in office, this in contrast to the anti-Navy policies of Coolidge and Harding. As a result we today have a great Army and a great Navy, and that is the real answer to the Tribune's charge that the American people have nothing tangible to show for the expenditures for preparedness.

Mr. Trohan's first article is, in part, as follows:

SURVEY REVEALS STRENGTH OF UNITED STATES ARMY AND NAVY
(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 20.—How strong is America? How strong is our Navy? How can we resist on land? What have we on land, sea, and in the air?

These questions are an important factor in the controversy over rearmament. One faction contends a Nazi "blitzkrieg" is on its way to America and the United States should build a gigantic defense establishment, no matter what the cost. The opposing faction, while recognizing the need for expansion, cautions against hysteria in the interest of building an efficient, adequate protective force.

Amid the sound and fury of oratory over the wisdom of spending billions for national security, the Navy contends the American fleet is the finest afloat and the Army asserts the land forces are at their greatest peacetime strength.

NAVY SURPASSES BRITAIN'S

The American Navy numbers a total of 369 men-of-war—41 more vessels than its nearest rival, Great Britain, which has 328 as nearly as can be ascertained. Italy has 276, largely destroyers and submarines; Japan, 254; France, 177, and Germany, 149. The naval figures are as of May 1, 1940.

It is true many of the American Navy's vessels are over-age, but no more so than those of the other great naval powers. The Navy has in its enlisted ranks 135,000 sailors, 25,000 marines, and almost 12,000 officers, making up the best personnel in the world in health, training, and education.

The Enlisted Naval Reserves total about 70,000 officers and men. In addition, there are almost 200,000 men with sea experience in the merchant marine and other craft, including yachts and motor-boats.

PEACETIME ARMY A RECORD

On land America has 228,000 officers and men in the Regular Army—the largest peacetime force in the Nation's history, and only about 50,000 short of the minimum defensive force set by experienced generals after the World War and still regarded as an ideal strength today.

In the National Guard are 235,000 officers and men. In the officer and enlisted reserve are almost 150,000. Citizen's military training camps and reserve officers' training units have a total enrollment of almost 200,000, which could be expected to volunteer in the event of war.

Altogether these would provide an additional protective force of almost 800,000 men. In addition, the Nation has a reserve well of more than 4,000,000 men who have received some form of military training or disciplined camp life, who could be readily whipped into an army.

In resistance against attack America still has the most favorable geographical position of any large power in the world. It is still protected by oceans on the east and west.

And in his second article, he states:

The American Navy today is confident it can defeat any fleet afloat. The Navy high command is certain the fleet can exercise its function of bringing an enemy to terms at a safe distance from American shores.

In his last annual report, released last November 25, Secretary of the Navy Charles Edison told President Roosevelt:

"I am glad to report that in my opinion the battle efficiency of the United States Fleet fully measures up to the confidence reposed in it by the citizens of our country in whose service it is dedicated."

"PERSONNEL SUPERIOR

"The morale of our personnel is high. The education and mental caliber of our enlisted men are superior. The fine quality of the leadership of the officers has been again confirmed by gratifying accomplishment in the naval operations conducted during the year."

The American Fleet in numbers is larger than any afloat. War losses of other powers have made and are making it stronger. Though more of its vessels are over-age than in the British Fleet, the fleet could, as it stands, hold off the British Navy, in the opinion of its officers.

BALANCED BUILDING PROGRAM

The Navy has a well-balanced building program designed to replace overage vessels. If the Navy should keep within its present limits with underage ships, it would be able to protect the United States, its possessions, and enforce the Monroe Doctrine, officers are confident. A 25-percent increase would provide a margin of safety, which may be desirable, it is felt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from the Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter written by one of the most prominent Republicans in my State to the chairman of the Republican National Committee, in which he advises the Republican convention to nominate Franklin D. Roosevelt for President. [Applause and laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, any man that calls himself a Republican and comes out and recommends anything like that, we do not want in the Republican Party. He ought to get out. [Applause and laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article in the current issue of the magazine Asia, one by Felix Morley and the other by Col. Morris Martin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a letter from the State legislative chairman of the American Legion Auxiliary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a letter I have sent to be read at the thirty-fourth annual convention of the Boys' Clubs of America.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF, 1941

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 544, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941; and pending that, may I express to the Members of the House, especially to the Members on the other side of the aisle, the appreciation of the committee for their cooperation in expediting the consideration of the bill yesterday. It is a difficult bill, in that it is of interest to every section of the country. It reaches into every congressional district, and there is not a Member of the House who has not had urgent representations from his district relative to matters affected by the provision of this bill. And yet in the entire discussion yesterday there was hardly an amendment to strike out the last word and no discussion of irrelevant matters. From the beginning debate has been reduced to a minimum on every amendment and on every section of the bill. I do not think any bill this session, subjected to such a heavy barrage of amendments, has been advanced more expeditiously than this bill up to the present time. And out of 30 amendments offered up to this time, only one amendment has been agreed to, and that by general consent.

We deeply appreciate the cooperation of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is it not the desire of the committee that we finish the bill before we adjourn today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we stay tonight until we dispose of this bill, and we hope that we will have today, as yesterday, the assistance of the entire membership to that end.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Could the majority leader state what he proposes to bring up tomorrow if we finish this bill today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Texas can best answer that.

Mr. RAYBURN. We intend to call up the so-called May bill, and on Saturday the bills from the Naval Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 544, the relief bill, 1941, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL AND SPECIAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 8. Funds appropriated in this joint resolution to the various Federal agencies shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1941, except where a different apportionment is specifically permitted by this joint resolution, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished to such agencies during such period for the purposes herein set forth.

Sec. 9. The funds made available by this joint resolution shall be used only for work relief or relief for persons in need except as otherwise specifically provided herein.

Sec. 10. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to allocate not to exceed \$20,000,000 to other Federal agencies for the operation, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner may prescribe, of projects of the type specified in subsection (b) of section 1 which are within the scope of the functions usually carried out by such agencies, including administrative expenses of such agencies incident to such operation: *Provided*, That not to exceed 4 percent of the total amount so allocated to any such agency shall be used for such administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That no project shall be prosecuted under any allocation under this subsection upon which the percentage of nonrelief persons employed exceeds 10 percent of the total number of persons employed.

(b) No Federal construction project, except flood-control and water-conservation projects authorized under other law, shall be undertaken or prosecuted under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless and until there shall have been allocated and irrevocably set aside Federal funds sufficient for its completion.

(c) No non-Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted under appropriations under this joint resolution (except under section 3) unless and until the sponsor has made a written agreement to finance such part of the entire cost thereof as the head of the agency, if the agency administers sponsored projects, determines under the circumstances is an adequate contribution taking into consideration the financial ability of the sponsor. The head of the agency shall prescribe rules and regulations relating to the valuation of contributions in kind by sponsors of projects through furnishing the use of their own facilities and equipment and the services of their own employees, which shall represent an actual cash value, and such rules and regulations shall also allow credit only to the extent that the furnishing of such contributions represents a financial burden which is undertaken by the sponsors on account of Work Projects Administration projects, or other sponsored projects.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Page 15, line 1, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for Federal projects and proposes to increase the amount in the bill to the amount provided for the current year. The \$40,000,000 for 8 months is, of course, equivalent to \$60,000,000 for a full year.

Money disbursed under this item provides both relief and Federal improvements. Under non-Federal projects the

only advantage accruing to the Federal Government is the effect on the unemployment situation. The structures, roads, buildings, and other improvements go to the States and to the municipalities sponsoring them. But under Federal projects the material benefits inure to the advantage of the Federal Government.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Would the gentleman consent to a modification of his amendment so as to provide \$50,000,000 for flood control and navigation purposes, rivers and harbors, and make it \$90,000,000?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee has not considered such amendment. We have been more than generous in doubling the amount for Federal projects.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The amendment which the gentleman from Missouri has just offered is somewhat less than the amendment which I send to the desk, which provided for \$60,000,000. I brought this matter up before the Appropriations Committee at the hearings, and I think that is a very reasonable compromise. Therefore I want to thank the chairman and the committee for having raised the amount to \$40,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am very glad to have the gentleman approve it. In view of the fact that the appropriation of \$40,000,000 is for an 8-month period, equivalent, at that rate, to \$60,000,000 for the 12-month period, we feel that the committee has been more than liberal.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The amendment which I intended to offer and the amendment which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has just offered—which makes my proposed amendment unnecessary—each of these authorizes an increase in the total amount which may be allocated to all Federal agencies. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

My amendment sought to raise the total of allocations which might be made during 12 months to all Federal agencies from \$20,000,000, as provided in the bill as introduced, to \$60,000,000. The gentleman's amendment would raise this limit to \$40,000,000 for 8 months. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has just stated, his amendment of \$40,000,000 for 8 months is at the rate of \$60,000,000 for the 12-month period.

In those localities where there is much unemployment and therefore the necessity exists for Work Projects Administration expenditures, and where also there are stations of the Army, I am convinced that it is in the public interest to employ relief labor on Federal projects under the supervision of the Army. Where the above conditions just stated exist I am also convinced that there should be direct allotments of relief funds from the W. P. A. to the Army, and that such projects should be conducted as Federal projects. The Army should not be required to secure its allotment of funds through the various State administrators.

My conviction as to the greater advantages, in economy and efficiency, of carrying on W. P. A. projects at Army posts as Army projects is based upon my personal and careful observation of W. P. A. work done at three Army stations in the vicinity of Denver, namely, Lowry Field, Fort Logan, and Fitzsimons Hospital. Therefore, I shall confine my statement to what I have personally observed of the greater economy and efficiency of the method of direct allotment to the Army of procurement of materials and of supervision by the Army in the case of W. P. A. work on Army posts.

I know the House is deeply interested in economy and in efficiency. We are all interested in making every dollar

appropriated for the W. P. A. go as far as possible for the employment of unemployed citizens. We all are interested in employing as many citizens as possible at the security wage and in spending no more than is necessary for the employment of supervisors, some of whom cannot be secured from the certified lists of the W. P. A. and all of whom command wages higher than the security wage. The more money spent on administrative personnel, the less is available for relief labor.

Although W. P. A. labor necessarily is not as efficient as work done under contract, I am sure we are all interested in securing the greatest possible efficiency from work done with W. P. A. labor—the greatest tangible results for very dollar expended. I believe we all are interested in having money appropriated for the W. P. A. expended so far as possible in such a manner that regular appropriations for essential Federal agencies may be reduced presently or in the future. The suggestion which I am making will, I am sure, tend at least to attain each of the desirable objectives which I have just mentioned.

My understanding is that Work Projects Administration favors the policy of requiring all other Federal agencies, including the Army and Navy, to secure their allotments of funds through the various State W. P. A. administrators, and to have each project administered and supervised by the W. P. A. and to have all materials necessary in carrying out such projects requisitioned and procured by the W. P. A.

It is my further understanding that the W. P. A. is of the opinion that they should go on the property of the other Federal agency, as, for example, the Army, and operate in the capacity of a contractor—the Army outlining specifically what is to be done and the W. P. A. supervising and doing the job.

I submit that such method of operation is more expensive both in time and money and far less efficient than the method by which the W. P. A. merely turns over certified relief labor to the Army and then the Army prepares the plans, buys the materials, supervises the work through its Quartermaster Corps, and makes the pay rolls.

To the extent that allotments are made directly to the Army, the W. P. A. is relieved from the responsibility of administering or supervising that number of relief workers. It saves the Federal Government overhead; it takes advantage of the already existing organization of the Army; it assures supervision by qualified personnel with long experience in handling men; it fixes responsibility.

On the other hand, if a project on an army post is carried on through an allotment of funds from the State W. P. A. administrator, the direct supervision of the work is given over to W. P. A. supervisors; and then, in order to be sure that the work is carried out in accordance with Army requirements, it is necessary for the Army to employ its supervisors to supervise and inspect the work of the W. P. A. supervisors. There is thus a duplication of overhead. If the method of direct allotment to the Army is followed, the entire work is planned, carried out, and supervised by experienced men in the Quartermaster Corps in accordance with Army requirements. There is thus saved a duplication of supervisors and more of the money allotted to such project on an army post can be used in putting to work unemployed men on the security wage, and less money is devoted to the wages of W. P. A. supervisors, many of whom are not on relief and all of whom necessarily must be paid more than the security wage.

Furthermore, the Army, and I understand some other Federal agencies, have their own purchasing departments. Therefore, if an allotment is made directly to the Army, work can start more promptly upon the approval of the project. In some cases, I am informed, there has been considerable delay in procuring the necessary materials for W. P. A. projects solely under the supervision of the W. P. A. In some instances, I understand, it has taken the W. P. A. 4 to 6 weeks, after approval of a project, to get materials on the ground and start the employment of relief labor; whereas the Army has materials available with which to start such work immediately after approval of a project.

In short, the method of making direct allotments to the Army employs Federal funds on Federal property with a minimum of overhead and of supervisory personnel. It assures supervision by experts already on the Army pay roll, familiar with the Army's requirements, instead of supervision by W. P. A. supervisors hired for a job with which they are not thoroughly familiar and who in turn must necessarily be supervised by the Army's supervisors.

I wish to make it very clear, indeed, that what I have stated is not in any sense a criticism of, or a reflection upon, any of the officials of the W. P. A. We have in Colorado an outstanding W. P. A. State administrator in Mr. Paul D. Shriver. I have the highest regard for all other W. P. A. officials with whom I have come in contact. It is significant, however, that every one of these officials with whom I have talked—and I have, over several years, talked with many—tell me that the efficiency of work done on Army projects under Army supervision is much greater—in some cases at least 10 or 15 percent greater—than that done on other projects. The reasons for this are very clear.

To summarize, by making direct allotments to the Army for projects for work at Army stations and having them conducted as Army projects, there is no duplication of supervisory personnel. The supervision is carried on by experienced men long familiar with work on Army stations and thoroughly familiar with handling men. In some cases I believe there is a substantial saving, both in time and money, in the procurement of materials. There is less delay in starting the job, because the necessary materials are immediately available through the Quartermaster Corps of the Army.

Still further, it accomplishes work of rehabilitation and minor construction which, if not done with relief labor, must necessarily be done, now or at some time in the future, with money which otherwise must be included in the regular War Department appropriation bills.

The primary object of W. P. A., of course, is to give employment to citizens who are desperately in need of work in order to live. The object of appropriating billions of dollars of Federal money is not primarily to improve America's towns and cities—although I represent a city where excellent W. P. A. work has been done, which has enhanced the convenience and beauty of Denver. But, after all, these are Federal appropriations. I submit that, so far as practicable, we should try to allot this money directly for work to be done for agencies of the Federal Government.

In that way we shall anticipate or render unnecessary in the future appropriations for much useful and necessary work for Federal agencies or for current work for such agencies. I have spoken of the Army because, as I said at the outset, I am personally familiar with their work at stations near Denver and am speaking of my own knowledge of the relatively more efficient W. P. A. work done at those Army stations. So far as it is practicable to furnish the same amount of employment to those on relief in any locality, I am convinced this Federal money should be spent for Federal purposes by Federal agencies.

Of course, I am speaking of where there is a real necessity for work to be done for a Federal agency, as in the case of improvements at an Army or Navy station. I do not mean that a Federal project should be set up where there is no need for it. But many of our Army and Navy stations are near larger centers of population where there is a congestion of the unemployed. Furthermore, for many years some of the Army and Navy stations were sadly neglected. There is still much work necessary to be done about them which could be done with W. P. A. labor. Adoption of my suggestion would not exclude other projects for cities and towns. But, so far as is practicable, I believe employment on useful and necessary Federal projects for Federal purposes and under the supervision of Federal agencies should be the means of providing work for those on the W. P. A.

I would allot a certain amount to the Army. I would allot it out of this appropriation and turn it over to the Army. It should be given to the Army for use on projects in localities

where there is unemployment and where they can usefully employ men out of work on projects which are needed.

Of course, I do not recommend this except in those localities where there is large unemployment. There are some Army posts in localities where there is no relief load to amount to anything. It would not be practicable there to carry out my suggestion. Certainly I do not recommend this procedure in the case of an Army post in a community where there is no large unemployment. Many of our Army stations are, however, near the larger centers of population where the density of unemployment is greatest.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of what transpired yesterday when I offered an amendment to take care of recreational park areas operated under the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, I wish to make a statement.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to announce that everything has been ironed out. I asked the Secretary of the Interior to send his representative to my office, and Colonel Harrington to send his representative. Then the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself sat around the table this morning for about three-quarters of an hour and reached an agreement with both the National Park Service and Colonel Harrington. They gave us not only assurance but double assurance that the projects will be operated during the coming fiscal year as they have been in the present fiscal year, that none of them will be closed down.

Yesterday some misunderstanding and confusion existed as to the intention with respect to the projects and their management. There is now a clear understanding for the first time between the Park Service and W. P. A. as to how this is to be handled, and that the present program and projects will be continued under the relief program as the bill is now before the House, and will be taken care of in a way that will be more satisfactory than ever before.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I always yield to my distinguished friend from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what he thinks about the method of calling up the heads of bureaus or agencies to have them promise to do something with public funds that are appropriated for a specific purpose. What assurance has the gentleman that they will carry out what he has in mind? Why not make it definite and put it in the law so they will have to carry it out?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Do I understand that under this agreement the program that has been constituted will be carried out and that there will be no cutting down of personnel or activities?

Mr. SNYDER. They will be carried out in every detail. Really, we gained something.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman think it would be safer to have it put in the law?

Mr. SNYDER. I think not.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on the plan that has been worked out.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NELSON. As I understand it, funds equal to what we have had for the present fiscal year will be available for the next fiscal year.

Mr. SNYDER. And I think a little more than we had last year.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I did not hear all of the gentleman's statement, but are we to understand that the W. P. A.

authorities have agreed to grant the request that allocations be made to the National Park Service in this matter?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman has their assurance?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; and I have confidence that it will be done.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I will gladly yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman understands my great interest in these recreational areas, since one of the larger areas is located in my district. Now, do I understand that as a result of this morning's conference an amount of the relief appropriation for 1941 is definitely available for the operation of these areas for another year?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; not only that, but I wish to say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], that this is the first time there was an harmonious understanding between the Park Service and W. P. A. as to just who would be the supervisory head and who would not.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. STEFAN. Was the Director of National Parks, Mr. Arno Cammerer, called in on this conference?

Mr. SNYDER. He sent Mr. Worth, his representative.

Mr. STEFAN. The plan is entirely satisfactory to Mr. Cammerer?

Mr. SNYDER. My understanding is that he delegated Mr. Worth to act in his place.

Mr. STEFAN. I have a high regard for Mr. Cammerer. He is one of the finest officials we have in the employ of our Government. I am sure that whatever is done under his supervision will be done right.

Mr. SNYDER. I am glad to inform the gentleman that Mr. Cammerer is in entire agreement with the plan.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Has the gentleman any objection to putting in the RECORD at this point the debate we carried on in connection with the gentleman's amendment yesterday?

Mr. SNYDER. I have not.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then I would like to ask permission to have the gentleman insert in the RECORD at this point in connection with his remarks the telegram which I read yesterday from our commissioner of conservation.

Mr. SNYDER. I shall be pleased to do that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The telegram I refer to reads as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 21, 1940.

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request your opposition to withdrawal from relief bill of \$450,000 for administering R. D. P. areas, operation of underprivileged group camps in the St. Croix area in Pine County will be curtailed if funds are withdrawn.

WILLIAM L. STRUNK,
Commissioner of Conservation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 15, at the end of line 12, add the following proviso: "Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of this act the sum of \$30,000,000 for flood control and \$20,000,000 for river and harbor improvement, of the funds herein appropriated shall be made available to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, under the direction of the Secretary of War for the prosecution of flood control and river and harbor projects on navigable streams and their tributaries, said funds to be expended for relief of unemployment under the same laws and regulations relating to the expenditure of funds regularly appropriated to the War Department for the same purpose."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I will ask for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. I want 2 minutes.

Mr. MAY. I ask 5 minutes for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who asked me to make the request.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I understand that will allow 10 minutes for the committee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment, and it is so simple that it hardly needs discussion. My idea about it is that since we were given \$130,000,000 for flood control last year and since the Bureau of the Budget has cut the flood-control allowance this year down to \$70,000,000, which is a reduction of \$60,000,000 on flood control alone, and in view of the fact that the President has just sent to the House of Representatives a veto message vetoing \$130,000,000 worth of rivers and harbors projects, it looks like the subject of flood control and our domestic activities for rivers and harbors is going to go on the beggar's list.

We need flood-control projects throughout the country. They are particularly valuable in every river in this country, and I call attention to the fact that my amendment provides for the expenditure of this fund under the same rules and regulations that these funds are appropriated to the War Department, but with due regard to the activities of the relief undertaken. Seventy-five cents out of every dollar expended in flood-control construction in rivers and harbors activities goes to labor and for employment of the unemployed.

I take the position that this is not increasing the appropriation in any sense, and, of course, it is not. This is merely providing that only \$50,000,000 out of \$975,000,000 of expenditures in 8 months shall be made available for substantial, worth-while public-works projects.

Mr. WARREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WARREN. Does the gentleman provide in his amendment that the expenditure shall be made on projects already approved by Congress or on projects approved by the engineers and not yet approved by the Congress?

Mr. MAY. The amendment provides for projects existing on navigable streams of the United States, the idea being that the matter would be left to the Board of Engineers to determine the feasibility of these projects under the existing Flood Control Act.

Mr. WARREN. I am afraid I did not make myself clear. Of course, no expenditures can be made on rivers and harbors or flood-control projects under existing law until the project has been adopted by the Congress. Is the gentleman referring to projects that have in the past been adopted; that is, several years back, or does he include projects approved by the engineers, like those in the veto message sent here the other day?

Mr. MAY. The language of the amendment is as follows:

For the prosecution of flood-control and rivers and harbors projects on navigable streams and their tributaries, said funds to be expended for the relief of unemployment under the same laws and regulations relating to the expenditure of funds regularly appropriated.

Mr. WARREN. I suggest to the gentleman that he reframe his amendment.

Mr. MAY. I shall be glad to accept the suggestion of the gentleman, and I will offer as a reframed amendment one which will provide for projects heretofore authorized by the Congress.

Mr. WARREN. No; approved by the engineers.

Mr. MAY. Or approved by the engineers.

Mr. WARREN. We did that once before in a former relief bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY, as modified: On page 15, at the end of line 12, add the following proviso: "Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the sum of \$30,000,000 for flood control and \$20,000,000 for river and harbor improvement, of the funds herein appropriated shall be made available to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, under the direction of the Secretary of War, for the prosecution of flood control and river and harbor projects authorized by the Congress or heretofore approved by the Chief of Engineers on navigable streams and their tributaries, said funds to be expended for the relief of unemployment under the same laws and regulations relating to the expenditure of funds regularly appropriated to the War Department for the same purpose."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the modified form of the amendment, I do not believe I care to say anything further on it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first real attempt to make this a bill for the relief of contractors rather than a bill for the relief of the needy unfortunate citizens of this country who cannot secure work with private industry. [Applause.] This amendment provides for the Army engineers to spend this money, and under the law they are compelled to let this work to private contractors. Remember this amendment says, "notwithstanding any provisions in this bill." That eliminates relief labor of such projects. Do you want to pass a relief bill for contractors or do you want to pass a bill for the relief of these unfortunate constituents of ours who cannot get a job in private industry? That is the question before you now. If you adopt this amendment, you are just taking away from the needy \$50,000,000 that should go to the needy people throughout the country, to carry on the general relief program. Do not forget that the President of the United States in vetoing the rivers and harbors bill—and I may say that for the first time in 15 years I had a project in that bill—said that in view of the situation confronting us at the present time, referring to national defense, we should not saddle any additional work upon the Army engineers. He needs the Army engineers to carry out his program of national defense.

I favor providing work for skilled labor. Do not forget it is skilled labor, not relief labor, that secures employment at union scale of wages on Federal Housing Administration projects, United States Housing Authority low-cost housing projects, on all the improvements at our navy yards and Army posts. We have not overlooked them. Skilled labor received the benefits of P. W. A. I have and will continue to help you take care of skilled labor but I will not assist you to do so in connection with this relief bill. Do not forget there are bank clerks, accountants, railroad clerks; in fact men and women who had fine office positions with large corporations who now find it necessary to accept work on W. P. A. as laborers. You make no provision to pay them the wages they formerly received. Treat all alike when it comes to this relief bill and keep it a relief bill, not a contractors' bill.

I hope this committee serves notice now that no amendments of this character, that are amendments for the relief of contractors, that take work away from the needy, are going to be adopted by this committee. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and especially to answer the argument, if it was an argument, advanced by my very good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. When he says that this amendment is an amendment purely for the benefit of contractors he is just as wrong as can be. He is absolutely

wrong. He says that if this amendment is passed it will be of no benefit to the poor people. How is any poor man expecting a benefit from any part of this bill if he does not work? This bill is not a dole, this is a work-relief program. This is a program for people who are going to work for relief, and they are going to work because they are going to get paid for it.

As far as contractors are concerned, although the gentleman lives on a river, he apparently does not know from a practical point of view how they conduct this kind of work on a river. These projects have a very large percentage of employment. This does not benefit my town one penny, but if the gentleman will come down to my district and see the flood-control work that has been put in he will find that all the work except that done by a few of the superintendents and officials is done by men taken from the relief rolls.

If this bill is passed it will help a city like Cincinnati, for instance. Cincinnati has introduced a special bill in Congress asking leave of this Congress to permit her to spend her own money in anticipation of the Federal Government coming on in future years to repay her, so that she can go ahead with her relief work in order to put people to work in her city. If the Congress had included a sufficient amount in the regular appropriation bill the work at Cincinnati and other places could go right on. That is the way it is along the river everywhere. It does not apply only to the Ohio River, it applies to every place where there is going to be public work of this kind on the rivers. We made this kind of an arrangement last year. The President has approved this kind of program on three or four different occasions.

If you want to take the position that this bill should not be amended by earmarking, that is one thing. If you want to go along blindly and say that this bill shall not be earmarked at all and stand on this floor and give some other sort of spurious excuse, that is up to you, but they ought to be good excuses that you give us, not an excuse such as the gentleman from St. Louis has offered.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. As far as the contractors are concerned, I would suggest that the gentleman read pages 977 and following and 750 and following of the hearings as to the unfair lobby of the Associated Contractors in support of this bill, endeavoring to put one over on the administration.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If I had any idea this money would go to contractors, I would be against it; but I know the contrary is true, because I have been in the fight here for years on this proposition. The President has stood with us time after time, and I say that to his everlasting credit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are objecting to earmarking, but I should like to refer to the section that was kept in the bill yesterday which earmarked \$500,000 for the Office of Government Reports, and, incidentally, I call the attention of the House to the fact that that certainly is not relief of the poor or the indigent.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; this amendment does not earmark a single dollar for a single city in this country. All it does is to earmark money for the working people; that is all. The amendment does not say where the money is going to be spent, whether in the district of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] or the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN], or any other district. It simply proposes to keep going a well-recognized endeavor, the value of which is recognized by everyone who knows anything at all about flood-control projects. The project they completed in Huntington, W. Va., this past year more than paid for itself in preventing one flood. Just think of that. You talk about these other projects being for contractors when there is no better class of project anywhere than this kind of project.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Does not the gentleman know that this is one of the most productive of work activities available for the unemployed of this country, and does not the House realize that this program is one that is not only giving immediate work to those who are employed on it, but it is saving tens of millions of dollars every year in the saving of property that would otherwise be destroyed by flood, as well as the saving of untold numbers of lives every year?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. There is no question about it. The percentage of labor is high against the percentage of material and the percentage of common labor is almost the total percentage. The amendment should carry. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the author of the amendment, if his amendment were to pass, would it be applicable to erosion-control work on rivers, projects which have been recommended and approved by the Board of Army Engineers?

Mr. MAY. It would in connection with the provision of law that relates to the activities of the Department of Agriculture that may cooperate with the Board of Engineers.

Mr. STEFAN. I have a condition in my district along the Missouri River which is a very serious one insofar as floods are concerned.

Mr. MAY. We all have them.

Mr. STEFAN. A large amount of valuable agricultural land has been destroyed or is being destroyed along that river as a result of erosion and floods. The Army engineers have made a survey and have recommended and approved an erosion-control program along that river on the Nebraska side. If this amendment is passed, perhaps we will have an opportunity there to do some valuable permanent work to protect the banks of the river and save the people of the Nation hundreds of dollars' worth of valuable agricultural land and, perhaps, some town property which the engineers say is in danger of future floods. This project would provide a lot of work for our unemployed people.

I understand that, as a result of the President's veto action in connection with our river program, there is no possibility of carrying out the engineers' recommendations. We now have no opportunity in my district to give any assurance to the farmers who own property along the Missouri River between South Sioux City and Niobrara that we will be able to give them assistance to protect their property unless we do something about it here. I hope this amendment is applicable to the conditions that now exist in my district.

I would like to give some assurance to my constituents now that something will be done for them. They are worried about this condition and had hoped, because the Army engineers did approve and recommend the project, they would get some protection from the Federal Government. Now that the Executive has disapproved river and harbor work we must look elsewhere for assistance.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. There can be absolutely no question about the fact that this is a step directly toward the gentleman's project. It may not reach your project because the money is not appropriated for any particular project, and that is the fairness about the matter, but there is no question that if they want to do so they can use the money for that purpose.

Mr. STEFAN. Heretofore I was unable to get relief work to build some riprapping or some protective dikes to protect this land I have in mind, but if you say this is applicable to this particular case in my district, it is the only avenue of assistance I can see that is available or that will give any encouragement to my people who own property along this river, and therefore I shall naturally support the amendment.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Let me make this observation to the gentleman. I have a flood-control project in my district and I appreciate the long-time value of such work. I do not know whether this amount will reach my district, but I am going to vote for this because I think it is a sound way to spend this part of the money, whether it reaches my own district or not, and I think the gentleman ought to do so also, regardless of whether the money comes into his particular district.

Mr. STEFAN. I am going to do all I can to get something done to save some of that valuable land in my district, and I shall take advantage of all present opportunities.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

When the river and harbor appropriation bill, officially known as the appropriation bill for the civil activities of the War Department, was up, that was the opportunity to increase the regular appropriations for flood control and for river and harbor work. No such amendment was adopted. The effect of the operation of an earmarking proposition on this bill is a direct taking of more money out of the Treasury for this item or alleged relief, because it will simply result in the President allocating more money to the first 8 months, to the extent of this earmarking, and we will have done the same thing as if we had increased the appropriation for rivers and harbors and for flood control under the regular civil-functions bill. I do not think we ought to do that.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. This amendment, as the gentleman understands, expressly provides "that of the funds herein appropriated," which does not increase them; and does not the gentleman think it would be more objectionable to leave it entirely to the President so that he could handle it in any way he desired?

Mr. TABER. The trouble is it does increase it, because the minute \$60,000,000 of these funds is earmarked for rivers and harbors and flood control, they will figure it will take just that much more for W. P. A. and they will crowd that much more of the money into the first 8 months of the fiscal year. That is the trouble about the matter.

Mr. MAY. That would have to come back to the gentleman's committee.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; because if the money is all used up the first 8 months, some Congress, not this one, next winter, would have to take care of the relief problem in some fashion with less money left out of the \$975,000,000. That is what the result of this thing would be. I don't like to see folks vote on it not understanding it thoroughly that it is just the same thing as if we have voted to increase the civil functions of the War Department bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has 3 minutes allotted to him. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] appears on the list, but he does not appear to be present.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have 3 minutes allotted to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entitled to recognition for 3 minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I have a telegram from Mayor George E. Leach, stating that the city of Minneapolis, and the officials of that city, are opposed to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]. I am in sympathy with the objectives sought to be obtained in this amendment, but, in view of the opposition of the city that I have the honor to represent, I shall have to vote against it unless the gentleman from Kentucky can assure us in Minneapolis that we will get a part of this fund which is sought to be earmarked and allocated for river and flood-control work.

As the gentleman knows, and as the gentlemen on the subcommittee know, I appeared before them several times in connection with the need for funds to start building of locks at the Falls of St. Anthony, in order to extend the 9-foot river barge line into the Minneapolis upper river harbor. A request was made by the Army engineers for that and other upper river projects in the sum of \$22,809,000, which request was cut down to \$2,788,500, which is just the amount I believe which was adopted in the House. In the \$22,809,000 request there was \$3,845,000 to be allocated for the purpose of starting the building of the locks in the falls of St. Anthony, but not a penny can be had out of the \$2,788,500 appropriated. Now, if we can get a part of this money covered in the May amendment allocated for starting that project, I will be inclined to be favorable to this amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman understands that this money is not allocated to any particular project, but is made available to the Board of Engineers, to be used on projects heretofore authorized by the Congress or heretofore approved by the Board of Engineers. Therefore, if the gentleman's project has been approved, as the gentleman says it has, it is eligible for a part of this money.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Has not the gentleman some understanding with the Army engineers as to how they are going to utilize this money?

Mr. MAY. Certainly not. I would not ask for such an agreement. I am only asking they apply it on the general projects of the country as their judgment deems proper.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Furthermore, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER] can lay this down as a proposition, regardless of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that this does not increase this matter one single penny.

Mr. ALEXANDER. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky, and in view of the telegram that I have received to which I have referred, I shall have to oppose the amendment. The telegram reads as follows:

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We are advised that there is a proposal made with reference to the W. P. A. appropriation bill now under discussion in House earmarking a portion of the minimum amount recommended by both the President and the House committee for other than W. P. A. purposes. If this proposal is effected the appropriation would be reduced for next year to an impossible figure, reducing present W. P. A. employment in this city by over 50 percent. Minneapolis must be given every available benefit and therefore recommend that you use every means to defeat said proposal.

MAYOR GEORGE E. LEACH,
Chairman of the Board of Public Welfare, Minneapolis,
Minn.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman has already stated that his project has been approved by the Board of Engineers. This money is made available only on projects heretofore authorized by Congress or heretofore approved by the Board of Engineers.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We can take no chances, as our financial situation makes it essential that we have the use of all W. P. A. funds which will be available under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if no one desires to speak, I shall close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri who has 3 minutes allotted to him, whether he desires to use all of the 3 minutes on the pending amendment, or by the gentleman from Kentucky, or does he desire to use a portion of it on the other amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall use it on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I must confess to some disappointment at my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] having offered this amendment. I appreciate his deep interest in flood control, but I am afraid that he has permitted his deep interest and the interest of his locality to overpersuade him in the present case. What is the proposition presented by the gentleman's amendment? The proposition is to take \$50,000,000 which would otherwise be expended for work relief and sink it in a project for which they are not required to spend \$1 for work relief. As the amendment reads, there is no requirement to employ a single relief laborer. That means that \$50,000,000 must be taken from your project or your State or your district and given to this one favored purpose for which Congress has already made ample provision.

Let us suppose that this amendment is agreed to and you go to W. P. A. with a meritorious application, and you say, "Here is a worthy project. It complies with every requirement. It is in a locality where there is need, suffering, and no opportunities for employment. We must have W. P. A. assistance at once."

The director of W. P. A. replies, "I fully agree with you. There is great need. The money would be wisely expended. You ought to have the project, but Congress has specifically directed us to spend the money for this purpose. The law is mandatory. It leaves us no option. W. P. A. has no choice. The Administrator has no choice. This amendment directs '\$50,000,000 shall be.'" So the director says, "I am sorry, but \$50,000,000 has been taken away from you and other districts, from other States, from other projects, in order to comply with the terms of the amendment presented by the gentleman from Kentucky."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Now this amendment further provides that the money shall be spent in accordance with the law providing for the expenditure of other funds under the jurisdiction of the War Department. What does that mean? That can mean only one thing. Money expended by the War Department under the law cited is customarily expended under contract. So in adopting such an amendment you would be turning this bill from a relief bill to a project bill, a contractor's bill.

It is an earmarking proposition. The House has so often expressed its disapproval of earmarking amendments I trust it will consistently vote down this one also. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] reserved 2 minutes to speak on the other amendment that was pending.

Mr. TABER. I yield it to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan want to use that time now or save some for the other amendment?

Mr. ENGEL. I will use it on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, when the Labor-Federal Security appropriation came before the Appropriations Committee I opposed the earmarking of \$50,000,000 for the C. C. C. out of relief funds. At that time I pointed out the fact that of the two and one-half billion dollars appropriated for the C. C. C. since the beginning of that organization only 23 percent went to the relatives of the C. C. C. enrollees.

I believe we should stop making appropriations for various purposes under the name of relief and at the expense of those on relief. If we want \$30,000,000 or \$60,000,000 for river and harbor or flood control, let us get it through a regular appropriation made for that purpose. [Applause.]

I have 15 harbors in my district. Twenty million dollars will be earmarked for rivers and harbors if this amendment

is agreed to. Nevertheless, I am opposed to it, because I know from experience that you cannot construct harbor and flood-control projects and use very much relief labor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman knows that this amendment specifically states that the money can be expended, notwithstanding any provisions in this law, which means that they do not have to hire relief labor?

Mr. ENGEL. River and harbor and flood-control money is spent usually by contractors for work done by machinery. Army engineers tell me only a small percent of relief labor can be used. If we are going to make appropriations for river and harbor or flood control, let us do it in the regular way and not under the guise of relief. I happen to be a member of the War Department subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which handles river and harbor and flood-control money.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. MAY. What do the words "to be expended for the relief of unemployment," in plain English, mean in this amendment?

Mr. ENGEL. How can you spend money and hire relief labor to build docks or harbors or flood-control projects, when the greater part of the labor required is of a technical nature? I know it cannot be done. We have had the matter up before our committee time and time again, and I have come to the conclusion that the money does not go to relief labor in the proportion it should go to relief labor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. MAY.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 49, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARTER of New York: Page 15, line 12, insert a new subdivision (a-1):

"For the purpose of qualifying needy persons for work in private industry and to help place such persons in private employment and to further the national-defense program of the United States of America, from the funds appropriated under this section, the Commissioner is directed to allocate \$60,000,000 to the Army and \$20,000,000 to the Navy and Marine Corps, which funds shall be expended for projects of training persons qualifying for Work Projects Administration employment, upon condition that such persons shall be selected by the representatives of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps located at the respective plants hereinafter referred to, in training schools heretofore or hereafter furnished, equipped, and conducted by and at the expense of manufacturing plants located within the continental United States of America carrying out contracts for the furnishing of materials to the Federal Government paid for through appropriations for the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps."

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee will again say that this is another earmarking proposition, but it is different. It merely earmarks to Federal agencies the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for the benefit of all of the country—no particular or single district. In this instance we are trying to do something for the needy people so that we can put them into private employment.

Now, what is the situation? Airplane manufacturers and shipbuilders are finding a complete shortage of men that can do work in building up our much-needed defense. They do not have qualified men. In my own area in Buffalo at least one of the plants has set up a training school at their own expense, but they are limited in the number they can take care of. Naturally, people who are on relief cannot attend

that school, because there is no compensation with which to keep their families together while they are learning.

This amendment simply attempts to rehabilitate some of the needy people who have accumulated as unemployed in this country over the last 10 or more years.

May I say right here that this idea came to me as the result of a letter I received yesterday from a young man who has traveled from plant to plant trying to get a job. In each instance he was turned down because he lacked experience. Why can we not take some of this money we are providing for W. P. A. employment and use it to rehabilitate these men so that in a few weeks they can get a private job?

What I attempt to do by this amendment is to allocate \$60,000,000 to the Army and \$20,000,000 to the Navy and Marine Corps—and that is the division the President indicated in his speech last Thursday—and have that money used to pay these people while they are in these training schools in different plants throughout the country which have contracts with the Government to furnish supplies to the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

The plants must furnish the quarters, their foremen as teachers, and everything else in conducting the school. The Government will merely pay these men so that their families can be kept together while they are learning a job with the definite knowledge that when they get through that course at the end of 6 or 8 weeks, they will have a job in private employment and will not longer be a charge upon their community. I have had word from two plants in my area stating that they are mighty interested in the idea behind this amendment in order to get men qualified to work in the plants. The plants would get nothing out of it except that at the end of the training course they would have somebody qualified to come in and help turn out the products that we are going to spend more billions for in the future.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTER of New York. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman realize that if the Commissioner or Administrator has the power to do it, it is not necessary to put legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. HARTER of New York. Yes; but I take it that the plants and Army, Navy, and Marine Corps would object to having the W. P. A. come into the picture because of the particular nature of the contracts. I am asking that this money be turned over to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, respectively. The officers of these services who are assigned to the various plants would pick from qualified, certified W. P. A. employees proper men for training in the plants. I believe there is complete cooperation between the plants and the military and naval officers assigned to the plants. That method of selecting students would do away with the objectionable feature of having other departments of the Government entering the picture. If you want to do something progressive and beneficial I feel you should adopt this amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 11:

"Sec. 11. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be expended on any project for the construction of any building, bridge, viaduct, stadium, underpass, tunnel, or other structure (1) the total estimated cost of which, in the case of a Federal project, exceeds \$50,000, or (2) the portion of the total estimated cost of which payable from Federal funds, in the case of a non-Federal project, exceeds \$50,000, unless the project is one (a) which has been approved by the President on or prior to May 15, 1940, or for which an issue of bonds has been approved at an election held, on or prior to such date, or for which a State legislature has made an appropriation on or prior to such date, or (b) for the completion of which funds have been allocated and irrevocably set aside under prior relief appropriation Acts: *Provided*, That in the case of a project for the construction of any non-Federal building to cost more than \$52,000 from Federal funds, the date 'May 15, 1940' in clause (a) shall be 'July 1, 1939.'"

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: On pages 16 and 17, strike out all of section 11.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour and 30 minutes, 10 minutes of the time to be reserved by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, as Members will recall, the relief bill last year contained a restriction providing that no funds should be expended on any Federal building the total cost of which exceeded \$50,000, or on any non-Federal building payable from Federal funds costing in excess of \$52,000. Let me emphasize the fact that the restriction in last year's bill applied only to buildings. The pending bill, however, provides a much more stringent and far more drastic provision. If you will examine the language of section 11 of the bill, you will find that in addition to buildings, bridges, viaducts, stadiums, underpasses, and tunnels, that the very broad and significant words "and other structures" have been inserted. It is generally conceded that these words are so broad as to include almost any possible construction which might be desired.

The words "and other structures" apply to the entire construction program of W. P. A., so I am advised as applied to the projects exceeding \$50,000. The construction program of W. P. A. constitutes more than 75 percent of the total W. P. A. program, and projects having an estimated cost of \$50,000 or more constitute 80 percent of the construction program of the W. P. A. So it is perfectly obvious that the practical effect of such language if permitted to remain in the bill would mean returning the W. P. A. to a leaf-raking program. This impossible requirement, if permitted to stand, would destroy and wreck the building program of W. P. A.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Would the gentleman be satisfied to strike out the phrase "and other structures"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Answering the gentleman, I would say I am personally of the opinion that the three words "and other structures" are extremely objectionable; in fact, the most objectionable part of the entire section; and certainly ought to be stricken. Let me say to the gentleman, however, that striking this very objectionable language would not cure the situation entirely, but would merely make section 11 less objectionable.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's amendment would strike out the whole section and take off all limitations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; and there is a particular and important reason for so doing. In these perilous times, with war spreading all over Europe, we know not when a grave emergency might arise. God forbid that war will ever in the future blight our own beloved America. But in this international crisis certainly Congress does not wish to tie the hands of the President of the United States by incorporating these drastic restrictive provisions in the bill. Under the provisions of the present act it would be impossible to build cantonments, regardless of the emergency, or even roads to such cantonments, or other urgently needed improvements in connection with national defense if these words "and other structures" are permitted to remain in the bill.

On the other hand, I will say that it has never been my thought that the W. P. A. should indulge extensively in the heavy-construction business, and under ordinary conditions there undoubtedly should be a ceiling above which the W. P. A. could not go. But these are not ordinary times, and when the committee goes so far as to include "and other

structures," no one can seriously contend that such language would not force the W. P. A. program into a boondoggling program, which none of us desire. [Applause.]

It has been suggested that the President of the United States is especially interested in the enactment of this amendment. Since the question has been raised, I might say that I was called to the White House today by the President and discussed this and other matters with him. I personally know that the President is deeply concerned about the effects of this drastically restrictive language.

As Members know, the President has sent to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] a letter calling his attention to the restrictive language in section 11 and asking that same be removed from the pending resolution. The letter of the President appears in full on page 9919 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21. It contains facts which Members cannot ignore. The President, in his letter, makes it plain that "the limitation would have a disastrous effect upon the W. P. A. construction program." Continuing, the President says:

It would prevent the employment of many needy employable persons at their regular occupation; it would force the operation of numerous small projects of doubtful value, with resulting complications in operation and administration; and would prevent the execution of much work that is greatly needed and which would produce results of great public value and benefit.

This statement of the President of the United States is clear, plain, and to the point. I sincerely trust that the pending amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the members of the committee what the President said with reference to section 11. He said:

The limitation contained in section 11 would have a disastrous effect upon the construction program of the Work Projects Administration. It would prevent the employment of many needy employable persons at their regular occupations; it would force the operation of numerous projects of doubtful value with resulting complications in operation and administration; and would prevent the execution of much work that is greatly needed and which would produce results of great public value and benefit.

Now, we are flying in the face of the objections voiced by our President. The mayor of New York City similarly voiced objections to the limitation, and he represented not only himself as mayor of New York but the United States Conference of Mayors. I have before me a similar telegram received from the borough president of the Borough of Brooklyn, Hon. John Cashmore, my dear friend and a very worthy and distinguished official. Brooklyn has 2,000,000 inhabitants and there is a great deal of work that ought to be done for needy employables in that borough. Our borough president of Brooklyn inveighs against this limitation. He knows what he is talking about. He states that if we keep this limitation in we will force these employees on inconsequential projects of real doubtful value and we will place them in the park to prune trees, prune bushes, and rake leaves. We do not want that. His telegram is as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., May 21, 1940.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

If the provision in section 11 of W. P. A. appropriation bill limiting buildings, bridges, viaducts, stadia, underpasses, tunnels, or other structures to \$50,000 is included, it will disrupt the work we are doing with the W. P. A. in Brooklyn and I am afraid will create a serious situation for the unemployed. We have tried to develop plans and advance worth-while improvements, and we think we have succeeded in doing effective work with the W. P. A. in Brooklyn. If the proposed limitation is incorporated into the law, our work will be confined to minor repairs and alterations and it will be difficult to create jobs for which the city would be justified in contributing 25 percent of the cost. I hope you will do your utmost to have this provision stricken from the bill before it is passed.

JOHN CASHMORE,
President, Borough of Brooklyn.

I call attention to the fact that on page 430 of the hearings Colonel Harrington testified that even the limitation in the present bill where you limit the construction of buildings to \$50,000 of Federal funds there were thousands and thou-

sands of dollars lost to employables because you could not and you would not erect a building if it cost more than \$50,000. What kind of a building, what kind of a project, can you construct in any large city, or in any city of any consequence, that costs less than \$50,000, less than \$60,000, or even less than \$75,000? Because of such limitation 260 buildings were, the past year, lost to W. P. A.; that is, 260 buildings under contemplation by Federal authorities and sponsored by States could not be built because of the present limitation in the present bill. According to Colonel Harrington, there resulted a loss of thousands of dollars to unemployed in 38 States, including the District of Columbia. These projects involved schools, hospitals, college buildings, armories, and county buildings, and there was local sponsorship in many instances up to 40 percent. In California 56 buildings were lost, involving an estimated cost of over \$14,000,000. In Georgia the limitation barred erection of 10 buildings costing over three and one-half millions; in Indiana, 8 buildings costing almost three millions; in Kentucky, 15 buildings; in Minnesota, 13 buildings costing \$1,672,000; in New Jersey, 13 buildings costing three and one-half millions; in New Mexico, 11 buildings costing over two millions; in New York, 8 buildings costing over three millions; in Pennsylvania, 28 buildings costing almost five millions; and so forth. That is great loss of purchasing power.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the \$50,000 limitation is not a limitation on the cost of the building? It is a limitation on the amount of Federal funds. You could build a hundred-thousand-dollar building and the Federal Government could pay half, or you could build a \$200,000 building and the Government could put up 25 percent, or \$50,000.

Mr. CELLER. I am aware of that. But we should not have that limitation in the bill. There should be some discretion left to the W. P. A. officials. Those officials have indicated to you the great number of projects which could not be undertaken because of the limitation in the present law. Now you wish to add many more absurd limitations. I cannot review all the figures, but it is interesting to note that the estimated cost of the buildings that could not be erected and for which there was local demand and sponsorship was upward of \$55,000,000. These buildings could not be undertaken because of the limitation that we now have in the current bill, namely, \$50,000 of Federal funds. I want to take out that limitation. In addition, I want to take the unreasonable conditions of section 11 of the pending bill. There should be no limitation at all.

When you use the words "viaducts, underpasses, bridges, and other structures" you have something as wide open as a barn door. What is meant by "other structures"? Would a road be included? There is great apprehension on the part of the experts that you will not be able to construct a road of any real consequence or of any real value under this bill. Structures are of all sorts, above and below the ground, and may be of any size and kind. You would prevent all kinds of structures. That is wrong. That is absurd. You would thereby wreck W. P. A. You would consign workers, skilled and unskilled, to inconsequential work mostly in parks.

The W. P. A. projects now permissible do not come in general competition with the work of general contractors. Without W. P. A. those structures would never be set up. There is no competition.

Seventy-five to eighty percent of the W. P. A. program involves constructions considerably above \$50,000. What are you going to do with the workers now on some 1,700,000 construction projects? Would you drown them? Would you shove them down a sewer? Would you place them in the Army or a concentration camp? Mr. Zachary, of the Associated Contractors, said, "Put them in the Army or put them on a dole." I would put them to work—self-respecting work, honorable tasks.

SHOULD W. P. A. CONTINUE IN CONSTRUCTION?

With regard to unemployment the American people are overwhelmingly committed to the proposition that work and

wages on socially useful improvements and services are far preferable to a dole. The Federal work program is the concrete expression of this belief. Through a partnership arrangement with States and local communities who sponsor and help finance work projects for their own unemployed, the W. P. A. in the past year provided socially useful work for an average of 3,000,000 needy unemployed. In so doing it vastly enriched the communities, poured purchasing power into the economic stream, and conserved our human resources against the day when they will be needed in private industry.

In operating this program every effort has been exerted to cooperate with private industry not to compete with it. The unemployed, for example, could have been set to work producing goods for themselves or for sale in the open market. Instead, except in one case, that of women's sewing and canning rooms, whose products are distributed free to relief families, they were put to work on public projects, creating community improvements and social services.

NO PRIVATE COMPETITION

The W. P. A. wage scale is an additional safeguard against competition with private industry. The W. P. A. does not pay its workers normal wages, but pays them so-called security wages which are about one-half the corresponding earnings in private industry.

This prevents the W. P. A. from bidding workers away from private industry, and creating an artificial labor shortage. W. P. A. workers are also compelled to accept any jobs offered in private industry, except when they are offered on manifestly unreasonable terms. Furthermore, the legislation recently enacted, appropriating funds for the W. P. A. for the 12 months beginning July 1, 1939, contained a provision requiring that all Work Projects workers shall be required to work 130 hours per month to earn the security wage. This is a salutary requirement which will provide a further safeguard against competition by the W. P. A. with private industry.

AS MUCH CONTRACT WORK AS EVER

Despite all precautions, there are certain sections of business that still complain of W. P. A. competition. Among those who have most frequently expressed this complaint are the construction contractors. According to some of their spokesmen every dollar of W. P. A. work is a dollar taken away from contract work.

It is true that a large percentage of W. P. A. work is in the field of construction. This, however, is not enough to establish the case for W. P. A. competition with contractors. Let us look at the record. Recently the Associated General Contractors, Inc., appeared before the House Appropriations Committee to testify on the relief bill. They submitted detailed figures on private and public construction over a period of years. What do these figures show? They show that in the boom period 1925 to 1929 public contract construction averaged \$2,292,000,000 a year. During the 3 years 1936 to 1938, inclusive, when the W. P. A. was in operation, public contract construction averaged \$2,168,000,000. In other words, private contractors are getting practically as much public construction as they got in the boom years before the depression of 1929.

The contractors' figures do show that there has been a very serious curtailment in private construction. But the W. P. A. does not build private houses, factories, or office buildings. It does not interfere with private construction.

W. P. A. PROVIDES JOBS MORE QUICKLY

Our experience during the last 6 years shows that while contract public works have a definite place in a recovery program they cannot be relied upon as the principal means of dealing with mass unemployment. They do not provide employment either as cheaply or as quickly as the W. P. A. method of Government-operated projects.

Nor does such contract employment reach the classes that are most desperately in need of help and in the seasons when they most need that help. Thus W. P. A. figures show that W. P. A. construction work tends to be contra-seasonal. When private contractors lay off workers, W. P. A. takes them on; when private contractors ask for workers, W. P. A. lays

them off. It is also a fact that the contract public-works program voted last year has yet to reach its peak of employment. On the other hand the W. P. A. can reach any reasonable peak of employment within a few weeks after Congress appropriates the funds.

REASONS FOR FORCE-ACCOUNT WORK

There has been some misunderstanding as to the reasons why the W. P. A. carries on the bulk of its construction work by the force-account method. This is principally due to two factors. The first and most important one is that, since the W. P. A. program must be expanded and contracted to meet current unemployment conditions, it has to be conducted with sufficient flexibility to enable this to be done. Therefore, the rigidity that would result from the adoption of the contract method of construction is not suited to the character of the program. The second factor is that difficulty has been encountered in attempting to enforce requirements that contractors shall take labor from the relief rolls.

However, the W. P. A. encourages sponsors of projects to enter into contracts in the largest degree possible. These contracts often provide that the contractor shall furnish supervision, equipment, and materials, and shall be the sponsor's representative on the job. The W. P. A. then furnishes labor to work under the contractor's supervision. The use of this method has proven very satisfactory in many places and is being adopted in an increasing degree throughout the country.

It is entirely proper that contractors' organizations should carry on a campaign to increase the work and profits of their members. But in the presence of our staggering unemployment problem, it is necessary to put aside private interests and take a public view of the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important amendment and I hope the committee will ponder it very carefully before adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma. Let us clear up just for a moment, if you please, what the effect of the language carried in the bill is.

In the first place, it has no limitation whatever upon road or highway construction, upon sidewalk or sewer construction, or anything of that kind. There is no limitation in the bill as to the size of those projects.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. I have been informed that the word "structure" has even been construed to apply to a fill on a road.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know who would put such a crazy construction as that on it, but take out the word "structure."

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. I do not know whether they are crazy or not, but that is the construction that has been put upon it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Take out the word "structure" if that solves it. Here is the proposition sought to be reached by this language. If you have a copy of the hearings before you, turn to page 1033 and read the statements of Mr. John P. Coyne, president, and Herbert Rivers, secretary-treasurer, Building and Construction Trade Department, American Federation of Labor, and note what they say about this proposition. After telling the disastrous effect upon the building-trades industry, not only on the industry but on the people who work for it, of the large heavy construction projects of W. P. A., Mr. Coyne states as follows:

And now, for the past 5 years, in an ever-increasing degree we are faced with yet the most serious threat of all—competition of the Federal Government of the United States for the work upon which the contractors of the Nation ordinarily would bid and upon which we as workers would be employed by the contractors. The whole future of the building and construction industry is threatened if such a move should be successful. I cannot impress upon you gentlemen too emphatically the real, far-reaching effect of such competition.

Mr. Coyne went ahead to point out to us how, for instance, in Los Angeles the W. P. A. sent their representatives, negotiated with the city, and bid and secured the contract for a \$2,500,000 underpass in Los Angeles, where a large percentage of the men employed were skilled workmen. W. P. A. then put workmen on that job from the relief rolls, and the skilled workmen in Los Angeles could not get jobs in the building and contracting industry and they themselves then had to go and take a place on the relief rolls.

The purpose of this provision is to take W. P. A. out of the heavy-construction program, and it ought to be done. You who are interested in the relief proposition in the cities, it seems to me, would want to spread this money.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. What are you going to do with the workers on these present projects?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There are plenty of small projects—sidewalks, sewers, plenty of things of that sort, and buildings up to \$200,000. Under this provision you can erect a building costing \$200,000, the Federal Government paying 25 percent of the cost. The \$50,000, bear in mind, is not the cost of the building or the structure but the amount of Federal funds which can be used. So you can build a \$200,000 courthouse, post office, school building, tunnel, viaduct, or underpass, and have the Government pay 25 percent of it, even under the language here, and it ought not to pay more than that and the size of the structures ought not to be greater than that. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, if I were interested in putting the stamp of approval on boondoggling I would certainly be against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, because under the decisions of the courts no worth-while projects can be undertaken by the W. P. A. unless this amendment is adopted. Let us briefly refer to some of these decisions.

We are accustomed to think of a structure as something above ground, in the nature of a building, but this is not necessarily the meaning of the word (286 Pacific 157).

A structure may be below the surface of the ground as well as above (137 N. Y. 1024).

A structure means any construction (69 N. E. Reporter 980).

The supreme courts of several States have held that "structure" includes an aqueduct, building, canal, derrick, electric power line, driveway, walk, retaining wall, ditch, drain, embankment, road, mine or mine pit, and poles planted in the ground.

What sort of worth-while work could be undertaken by the W. P. A. with this language in the bill? The distinguished gentleman from Virginia has said the purpose is to take the W. P. A. out of heavy construction. I say that the purpose of this language is to take the W. P. A. out of any worth-while work. The projects in the district I have the honor to represent are viaduct projects; projects that have provided sewers and have provided water for many thousands of our people; projects that have reflected great credit on this great program; projects that have been devised by cautious, patriotic citizens; projects that have not only added much to the wealth of my community but have provided thousands of hours of work for fine hard-working citizens who, through no fault of their own, can otherwise earn a living. None of this work could be done unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is adopted, and I sincerely trust that the Members will not take any chance on what the courts may do in the future, because we know the construction that has been placed on this language heretofore. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, would be a long step in the direction of the socialization of America. Are we ready to take that step? Both business

and organized labor oppose this amendment, because they believe it leads to evil implications and tendencies.

If we want to project the W. P. A. with a vengeance further into the construction field in competition with private industry, and entrench it there, this amendment will do it. I do not think we want to do that.

I have never felt that it was our purpose in creating the W. P. A. to set up a giant construction activity, the largest perhaps in the history of the world, but that is what the W. P. A. has grown to be. I have always thought that the W. P. A. was intended to be a humanitarian relief agency, temporary in character, to minister to human needs and not an activity that would preempt and permanently take possession of the construction field, driving private builders to the wall and spreading bankruptcy and ruin throughout the building industry.

It has grown until it is destroying one of the greatest industries in the country because private unsubsidized employers cannot compete with the Federal Treasury, and at the same time it is forcing hundreds of thousands of skilled craftsmen onto the relief rolls.

If you want to get an idea of how the W. P. A. is encroaching upon the field of private construction turn to page 413 of the hearings on this bill. You will find there a list of construction projects undertaken and completed by W. P. A. from the start of the W. P. A. program.

It is an amazing list from which I quote just a few of the main items:

Public buildings constructed, 23,003.
Public buildings reconstructed, 62,468.
Additions to public buildings, 2,784.
Educational buildings constructed, 4,095.
Educational buildings reconstructed, 28,416.
Additions to educational buildings, 1,533.
Schools constructed, 3,985.
Schools reconstructed, 27,664.
Additions to schools, 1,480.

The list of new construction includes 11,704 recreational buildings, 318 auditoriums, 848 gymnasiums, 1,063 office and administrative buildings, 1,739 garages, 1,479 storage buildings, 7,488 other public buildings, 1,640 stadiums with a seating capacity of 2,742,069; 2,140 fair grounds and rodeo grounds; 2,490 athletic fields embracing 14,198 acres in area; 1,365 hand-ball courts; 1,751 horseshoe courts; 7,759 tennis courts; 629 swimming pools, 207 golf courses with 2,287 holes; and so forth.

The figures showing the vast and varied construction activities of W. P. A. are stupendous.

Now reference has been made in a disparaging way to the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., who sent a delegation to advise our subcommittee how the W. P. A. is boring into the construction industry. The fact remains, however, that these gentlemen represented 2,500 employers and 3,000,000 workmen, scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Surely that is a section of our industrial fabric of sufficient importance to merit a hearing. At their head was H. B. Zachry, president of the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., who explained impressively how the expenditure of appropriations made to the Work Projects Administration has affected private construction. I quote from his testimony—pages 973 and 974 of the hearings—as follows:

We believe that the relief problem can be solved only by the accomplishment of full recovery of all lines of industry and agriculture. We maintain that this goal cannot be achieved by displacing those already employed in a given occupation. The construction industry has viewed with increasing alarm the activities of the Work Projects Administration in the construction field. It first witnessed undertakings of minor consequence during the depth of the depression. To a large extent these operations were not in direct competition with construction. However, this has since been changed to a radical degree, and W. P. A. is now deeply entrenched in public construction and is making every effort to expand its activities in this field and to program its work for years ahead.

Not only is W. P. A. absorbing the present market in the public-works field, but it is reaching out in every direction to assure itself a continuing program in this field.

Labor, which has heretofore been self-sustaining on the pay rolls of private employers, now finds the only outlet for its services through the relief lines. The tragic part of the whole pro-

cedure is that this cycle can produce but one result, a permanent ever-increasing relief roll. There cannot be any other prospect for the simple reason that these processes of displacement permanently dry up the opportunity for employment with private employers in this field. The movement is, therefore, to the relief rolls and not from them.

It was Mr. Zachry's opinion, positively asserted, that the adoption of an amendment to the W. P. A. law, such as is now before us, would send half a million men to the relief rolls. I quote from the hearings, page 995, as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW. What would be the effect on the construction industry if that limit were removed entirely, and W. P. A. were given carte blanche to enter the construction field?

Mr. ZACHRY. They would do the construction work, and all the other workers would go on the relief rolls; 500,000 men would go on the relief rolls.

Mr. LUDLOW. All of them?

Mr. ZACHRY. Yes, sir; 500,000.

Mr. TABER. Over what territory would that extend?

Mr. ZACHRY. Over the United States.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], in speaking on this subject, paid his compliments in none too complimentary terms to the contractors who are opposing the W. P. A. intrusion into the construction field but he overlooked entirely one other potent opposition to this proposed amendment which would let down all of the doors and allow the W. P. A. to invade the construction field. The element opposing W. P. A. construction activities which he strangely overlooked is the American Federation of Labor.

That great and sound labor organization is unalterably opposed to this amendment. It sent John P. Coyne, president, and Herbert Rivers, secretary-treasurer of its building and construction trades department, to testify before our subcommittee, and Mr. Coyne announced that he represented 19 national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation with a total membership of 1,100,000. There is a widespread complaint, heard everywhere in the ranks of union labor, that the infiltration of unskilled W. P. A. labor into construction activities is breaking down the union ranks and forcing trained and skilled craftsmen into the bread lines. My Coyne did not mince words. He said that when the construction industry prospers the Nation prospers, and that when it suffers the whole Nation is affected, and he added:

For the past 5 years, in an ever-increasing degree, we are faced with the most serious threat of all—competition of the Federal Government of the United States for the work upon which the contractors of the Nation ordinarily would bid and upon which we, as workers, would be employed by the contractors. The whole future of the building and construction industry is threatened if such a move should be successful. I cannot impress upon you gentlemen too emphatically the real, far-reaching effect of such competition. It even threatens in a vital and fundamental way the very democracy of our country.

The adoption of the pending amendment would give the W. P. A. carte blanche authority to erect monumental structures, regardless of size and cost. It could repeat over and over again what occurred in New York, where the W. P. A. started to erect a building on the World's Fair grounds at a cost of \$150,000 and ended by erecting a palatial edifice at a cost of \$720,000, presenting it with the compliments of the American taxpayers to the city of New York. That city has the largest per capita wealth of any city in the world, and it irks me to think that the people of my city, many of whom are hard pressed and some of whom are half starving, have to be taxed along with similar folks all over the country to erect this building and present it to the richest city on the globe. The policy of projecting the W. P. A. into the construction field to the ruination of private industry and the injury of organized labor is a fatuous, un-American policy, and in my opinion this amendment should be defeated overwhelmingly.

I plead with you, let us not fasten such abnormal and unsound recovery methods permanently upon the country. We should seek to bring about recovery by a revival of business and industry and not by the destruction of business, industry, and organized labor. [Applause.]

I want to call attention before I sit down to an amendment which I propose to offer. I shall offer an amendment, to which I invite the attention of the Committee, on page 16, line 14. I propose to insert "or" preceding the word "tunnel",

and after the word "tunnel" strike out the words "or other structure." The elimination of these words would permit the use of W. P. A. funds in any amount for national defense construction operations. It would remove all possible objection to the limitation which the bill proposes to place on W. P. A. construction work.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Why does not the gentleman offer the amendment now as a substitute and then the matter will be before the Committee?

Mr. LUDLOW. I offer the amendment at this time, Mr. Chairman. This would take out the words which, I think, are most objectionable to the opponents of this provision in the bill, and I hope that we will all be able to get together on the perfecting language which I suggest.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state with respect to the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Indiana that there are two other amendments on the Clerk's desk and the Chair would like to reserve some time for the consideration of those amendments.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, in order to clarify the parliamentary situation, I now offer the amendment as a substitute for the Johnson of Oklahoma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUDLOW as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Page 16, line 14, insert the word "or" preceding the word "tunnel" and after the word "tunnel" strike out "or other structure."

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I find in my State this situation. The most worth while and the most valuable projects that we have out there and the projects that will do the most permanent good are small reservoir projects.

I want to read to the House here today this statement. There are 30,696 farms in my State. Of this number, 1,440 farms comprise less than 3 acres; 5,000 farms less than 10 acres; 8,000 farms, or 27 percent, less than 20 acres.

Now, what we are doing in the State of Utah and what they are doing in all of the irrigation States today is trying to conserve every drop of water we can conserve to keep farmers like I have described here on little farms on the farms instead of putting them on the relief rolls. Under the present language of this bill there is not one small reservoir project in my State that has been surveyed that can be constructed if any W. P. A. labor is to be used on it. The result is simply this, that instead of employing your W. P. A. labor on projects that are worth while, they can only be employed on what have been termed "boondoggling projects." It is a nice thing and an easy thing for some contractor or for skilled labor to say that the W. P. A. should be kept out of the building industry. I agree with that, but, on the other hand, when the restriction is so severe that it prohibits the building of worth-while projects, then, in my opinion, it should be eliminated from this bill.

I also want to call your attention to another project. The State Legislature of Utah appropriated money enough, if supplemented by W. P. A. funds, to build armories in every city in Utah where there was a National Guard unit. We have built a National Guard armory in every city in Utah that has a National Guard unit with the exception of Salt Lake City. There we find the National Guard housed in an old college building. Inadequate, it has been condemned as unfit for use; and we find their equipment over 3 miles away, housed in an old shack of a building down at the State fairgrounds, an invitation to sabotage by any subversive influence in the United States. The legislature has tried to cooperate, they want to cooperate, and they want an armory and an adequate armory in every city in Utah where there is a National Guard unit, but they find that under the restrictive language of this bill and the one that preceded it they cannot construct this building in Salt Lake City.

I ask that the amendment be agreed to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Ludlow substitute will be agreed to. I think the substitute should meet any justifiable criticism of the section as worded by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, W. P. A. was created as a relief agency. It was not created with the intention, in my judgment, of becoming a giant construction industry in competition with legitimate private industry in America.

Now, what is the situation today? If you will look at the hearings or at my remarks of Thursday last you will find a table furnished your committee showing the percentage of the total public-construction work in America which has been taken over by W. P. A. It starts in 7 years ago at 8½ percent, and it gradually increases until in the calendar year 1940 it is estimated that W. P. A. will actually take over 54 percent of the entire public-construction work in this country.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I wonder how the statement just made by the gentleman could be so, if the statement issued by the Associated General Contractors of America is correct, which shows that in the boom period, 1926 to 1929, public-contract construction averaged \$2,292,000,000 a year, and when the W. P. A. was in operation, 1936 to 1939, public-contract construction averaged \$2,168,000,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings he will find a table that purports to set out specifically in dollars and in percentages the picture from 1932 to 1940, inclusive.

The result in a word is this, that we have set up an enormous construction agency, that threatens to take over 54 percent of all public construction in America, and in so doing to keep out of employment thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of skilled workers in the building trades in this country. The construction work is done at a labor cost about double the cost which would be required if the job was done under contract labor by our skilled workers qualified to do the work.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has referred to the statement of Mr. John P. Coyne, president of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, a statement made on April 15, 1940, on behalf of 1,100,000 building and construction tradesmen. I commend the statement in its entirety to the consideration of the members of this Committee.

Speaking on behalf of the workers whom he represents and on behalf of the entire industry, Mr. Coyne stated that he appeared to add his voice to the plea that Congress give this industry—second only in size to agriculture—an opportunity to attain the complete recovery which it has been struggling, against great handicaps, to achieve since 1929.

Tracing the difficulties by which the industry has been confronted as the result of governmental policies pursued in recent years, he made the following statement, a part of which has been quoted by the gentleman from Virginia:

And now, for the past 5 years, in an ever-increasing degree, we are faced with yet the most serious threat of all—competition of the Federal Government of the United States for the work upon which the contractors of the Nation ordinarily would bid and upon which we as workers would be employed by the contractors. The whole future of the building and construction industry is threatened if such a move should be successful. I cannot impress upon you gentlemen too emphatically the real, far-reaching effect of such competition. It even threatens, in a vital and fundamental way, the very democracy of our country.

And note this:

This perhaps has to date been the most drastic and bold thrust of this administration to socialize any industry.

Mr. Chairman, the eloquent appeal by Mr. Coyne as president of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor was reinforced among others by the Massachusetts State Building Trades Council,

by the Building and Construction Trades Council of Boston and vicinity, both affiliated with the A. F. of L., both not only opposed to the removal of the present limit but in favor of a reduction of that limit to at least \$25,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Ludlow substitute will be adopted, and that we can all go along on that basis.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Two or three amendments have been sent to the Clerk's desk, and, in the judgment of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is a perfecting amendment, rather than a substitute. The Chair makes the suggestion in the interest of orderly procedure that gentlemen who are offering amendments have their amendments read for information, and then amendments which are perfecting amendments can be passed on before the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma to strike out the paragraph is voted upon.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, would the vote not first come on my perfecting amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote would come first on perfecting amendments, and then on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma to strike out the section. The Chair suggests that gentlemen who have amendments to offer may offer them from the standpoint of information, and perfecting amendments will be voted on before the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma to strike out the section.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the desk which is not a perfecting amendment, and which strikes out section 11, but places in its stead the old section 12 of last year's bill. I desire to have 5 minutes of my own on my amendment. It is not connected with the Johnson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas could be voted on before the vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma to strike out the section.

Mr. TERRY. That was not my understanding with the Chairman of the Committee. It is my understanding that my amendment would be voted on after the Johnson amendment is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. It could be voted on either before or after, as the gentleman may elect.

Mr. TERRY. I prefer to vote on it after the Johnson amendment is disposed of and take my time then.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may refrain if he wishes until the vote is had upon the Johnson amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Is it not the proper thing at this time to vote on the Ludlow amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is entirely parliamentary. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COCHRAN) there were—ayes 44, noes 40.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. LUDLOW to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 104 and noes 34.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KELLER. I understood when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] offered his motion it was offered as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair ruled that the amendment was not in the nature of a substitute, but in the nature

of a perfecting amendment, inasmuch as it merely struck certain words from the section.

Mr. KELLER. Then are we in this position: That we come now to a vote on the Johnson amendment as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana?

The CHAIRMAN. We will come to a vote on the Johnson amendment to strike out the section after perfecting amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Ludlow amendment was adopted and that accomplishes the purpose of my amendment, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not yet offered his amendment. It was simply on the Clerk's desk. Consequently it may be withdrawn.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the vote now on the Johnson amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will recur on the Johnson amendment to strike out the section when perfecting amendments have been submitted.

Mr. COCHRAN. In other words, a vote for the Johnson amendment is supporting the President of the United States?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEAVY: Page 16, line 11, strike out section 11 and insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 11. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be expended on the construction of any building (1) the total estimated cost of which, in the case of a Federal building, exceeds \$50,000, or (2) the portion of the total estimated cost of which, payable from Federal funds, in the case of a non-Federal building, exceeds \$52,000, unless the building is one (a) which has been approved by the President on or prior to July 1, 1939, or for which an issue of bonds has been approved at an election held on or prior to such date, or for which a State legislature has made an appropriation on or prior to such date, or (b) for the completion of which funds have been allocated and irrevocably set aside under prior relief appropriation acts."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to know whether the amendment is offered as a perfecting amendment or as a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment is to strike out and insert.

The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a somewhat difficult position due to the parliamentary situation. It is not my desire that the amendment I have now offered should be adopted if the Johnson amendment is adopted. I feel that the Johnson amendment ought to be adopted; but if it fails, then an amendment of the character that I have here offered ought to be adopted.

I understand the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] has a similar amendment to the one I have just submitted.

If the Johnson amendment is adopted I shall ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment here offered is the identical language to that found in the current act. There is only one change, and that has to do with a situation where an appropriation was made by the State of Iowa by its legislature. That language is included in the bill we have under consideration; but otherwise, by my amendment, we are reenacting section 12 of the current act of last year's W. P. A. Act.

Now, I want to explain to the House why I think the Johnson amendment ought to prevail, irrespective of the amendment I have offered here. The Johnson amendment is interwoven with national defense. This question of national defense is not a partisan question. This question of national defense identifies itself with the Johnson amendment, and I will show you why.

The President sent a message to this House day before yesterday in the form of a letter addressed to the chairman

of this committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 6514, and here is the request of the President in reference to section 11. I shall read that message, which is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: My attention has been called to section 11 of the House Joint Resolution 544 now under consideration in the House of Representatives, which provides funds for the Work Projects Administration for the fiscal year 1941. Section 11 in general prohibits the expenditure of these funds on any project for the construction of any building, bridge, viaduct, stadium, underpass, tunnel, or other structure, if the total estimated cost in the case of a Federal project exceeds \$50,000, or if the portion of the total estimated cost payable from Federal funds in the case of a non-Federal project exceeds \$50,000.

The report of the Committee on Appropriations concerning this section merely states:

"It is believed that this is a sound limitation, for the joint resolution is designed to give work relief and it has been demonstrated that the larger the structure the lower the proportion of relief labor used on it."

The Commissioner of Work Projects informs me that the proportion of relief labor on large construction projects is in many cases greater than on small projects, and, furthermore, that the over-all proportion of relief labor on all construction projects now in operation is between 96 and 97 percent.

The limitation contained in section 11 would have a disastrous effect upon the construction program of the Work Projects Administration. It would prevent the employment of many needy employable persons at their regular occupations; it would force the operation of numerous small projects of doubtful value with resulting complications in operation and administration; and would prevent the execution of much work that is greatly needed and which would produce results of great public value and benefit.

The limitation would have a particularly harmful effect upon the attempt which is being made to use the program of the Work Projects Administration to further national defense. That administration during the next year proposes to give preference and priority to projects which have a value from the national-defense standpoint, and the prohibition which is contained in section 11 would operate to prevent the approval and operation of the great bulk of such projects.

In view of the reasons set forth above, it is my opinion that the limitation contained in section 11 should be removed from House Joint Resolution 544.

Very truly yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

P. S.—I am reminded that in the first year in which the Government set up relief projects there was a good deal of fun poked at raking leaves, cleaning up parks, and so forth, and at that time the word "boondoggling" became part of our political vocabulary. It is true in those days, when the emergency of relief was great and the machinery new, there was a certain proportion of projects which did not have any particular permanent value.

I think that people who insist on the limitations in section 11 may, with some justification, be charged with a desire to return to boondoggling.

F. D. R.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. LEAVY. No; I do not have time. I am sorry.

If we in this House do, as the other body did yesterday, vote for a national-defense program that will run into billions of dollars, and then deny the Chief Executive his specific request with reference to the free use of W. P. A. funds for use, in whole or in part, for the Nation's defense during the next year, it seems we are most inconsistent. When this bill was written 3 weeks ago the situation was entirely different. I am satisfied, and I am sure you all are—and I say again, irrespective of political affiliations—had this request which I have just quoted come from the Chief Executive to the committee when they were framing this bill, section 11 would never have appeared in it. To be consistent and to do that which undoubtedly is at this time of major importance, and in my judgment is for the best interests of our country in this critical period, we should now follow the recommendation of the President and that irrespective of how we may differ with him in political matters. We should not strait jacket the expenditure of these W. P. A. funds if any part of them are to be spent for national defense. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Washington that in order for his amendment to be voted on after the vote on the Johnson amendment he would

have to procure unanimous consent to withdraw it and resubmit it at that time.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment and resubmit it after the vote on the Johnson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE W. P. A. \$50,000 LIMITATION AND SPONSORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the letters, telegrams, and other requests I have had in the past few days from mayors of villages and cities in my district in Minnesota expressing opposition to the \$50,000 limitation on W. P. A. projects, I shall have to represent their views and support the Johnson amendment now under consideration. My own home city of Minneapolis has on frequent and repeated occasions expressed disapproval of the limitation as it eliminates practically all worth-while projects which might be undertaken in a city the size of ours.

In addition I have had messages from many smaller towns and cities of which I have several here in my hand and select two from the group as being representative. From Ben B. Moore, recorder of the village of Edina, in which is located the excellent country club district with its hundreds of new residences, I have the following message:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., May 20, 1940.

JOHN G. ALEXANDER,

Third Minnesota Congressional District,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Regarding work-relief bill coming up House Tuesday, May 21. All members Edina Village Council believe the \$50,000 limitation amendment as well as sponsor's 25-percent mandatory contribution be left to discretion of W. P. A. While believing construction belongs to the construction industry there are cases where proposed amendments would work hardship on communities having high relief and W. P. A. loads. Believe best to handle by permitting W. P. A. discretion in deserving and unusual cases.

BEN B. MOORE,

Village Recorder, Village of Edina, Minn.

And from the fast-growing suburban city of Robbinsdale I have the following message calling attention to their \$180,000 project:

ROBBINSDALE, MINN., May 22, 1940.

JOHN G. ALEXANDER,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Have \$180,000 sewer, water, and street project in Washington for O. K. Will appreciate your opposing limitation clause of \$50,000 in work-relief bill. Clause eliminating sponsor's contribution is favorable.

CITY OF ROBBINSDALE.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TABER. In opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. The House a while ago, by an overwhelming majority adopted the amendment which I offered striking out the words "or other structures." The point I wanted to bring out when I asked the gentleman from Washington to yield to me was that this amendment having been adopted, W. P. A. had been thrown open for use in connection with the national defense in almost any way that might be practical. So the argument he made that section 11 of this bill would interfere with national defense is without foundation. The adoption of my amendment opens the way for the use of W. P. A. funds in construction work for national defense. That is certain.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is correct, and I believe the amendment he offered removes any legitimate objection that anyone might have to this section. It certainly opens it up so that it unquestionably permits water mains to be built; it unquestionably permits sewers to be built; it unquestionably

permits almost any other type of construction to be engaged in.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Briefly.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. In connection with the armory at Salt Lake City, we have tried for a year to build it with some W. P. A. funds, but found that we cannot. As a matter of national defense it should be built. It could not be built, however, without striking out section 11 of the bill.

Mr. TABER. I do not think that would be a matter of national defense at this time. I think the spending of large sums of money on armories at this time would be just the reverse of national defense. The money should be spent for something immediately effective.

I feel that it is absolutely necessary unless we are going to destroy entirely our construction industry and throw on relief all of those masons, carpenters, painters, and other workmen accustomed to work on large governmental, municipal, and State projects, that we keep W. P. A. out of such projects. One of the worst troubles with W. P. A. projects—and I think some of you gentlemen upon my right might have an influence in clearing it up—is that we are going ahead to make new construction propositions, new pavements, new roads, instead of spending the time and attention we should upon the maintenance of the structures, roads, pavements, and streets that we have. I think the W. P. A. should authorize as projects major repair jobs on such things as I have described. That would help keep people at work, it would really give them something to do along the lines for which their labor is fitted.

I hope, now that the Ludlow amendment has been adopted, the Committee will refuse to adopt the Johnson amendment, and that we can go along through with this section. I can see no possible disadvantage to W. P. A. in doing it. It will keep them out of too many large projects which are a menace to them and a menace to the public.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. Does not the gentleman feel, however, in view of the tremendously changed conditions in the last 10 days, when the Chief Executive of the United States asks this Congress in the interest of national defense that we do something, that we ought to go along with him? He asks that section 11 be stricken.

Mr. TABER. I think the President made that request not understanding in full the situation. I say this believing that the gentleman in the White House has so many things on his mind at the moment that it is impossible for him to go into all of them completely. I say it without any disrespect whatever.

I hope the Johnson amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the building industry is one industry that still has a surplus of skilled labor unemployed. Because of the short-sighted policy of the administration during the last 7 years, many industries find themselves without a sufficient number of skilled workers; for example, the airplane industry and allied industries manufacturing airplane parts today find themselves without a sufficient number of skilled workers.

The President only a week ago at almost this very hour asked for 50,000 additional airplanes. As a matter of fact, the airplane industry is finding it difficult to produce 8,000 to 10,000 airplanes today with the facilities they have and the number of skilled laborers available. I do not see how we shall be able to produce an additional 10,000 planes during the next year even if we vote up all the funds the President has asked for because of the shortage of skilled labor.

In voting for the Johnson amendment we are voting to lessen the incentive for training of skilled labor in the building industry.

It is essential, of course, to keep people on W. P. A. who need employment. It is essential to provide an incentive for private industry to keep the skilled labor in this country employed and to lessen the danger to national defense and national security.

If you will examine the statements made by experts in the airplane industry, and in the manufacturing industry generally, you will find they cannot get a sufficient number of skilled workers to carry on in their plants. The greatest difficulty we have in producing airplanes in this country is through lack of skilled labor. Here you have the building industry asking for protection. Let us give them the protection they ask for and not put them in competition with W. P. A. and unskilled labor when they need this protection so sorely today. Every labor organization throughout the Nation joins in this appeal. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this body to the following facts: The first duty we owe to the American people at the present time is to give those men a chance to work who are out of work. The gentleman who just preceded me has pointed out that most skilled laborers are not out of work, which is according to the record. Our difficulty is putting to work and keeping at work our unskilled workers. Everyone knows that the proportion of skilled workers to unskilled workers is very, very small. No matter what their previous work has been, we still ought to stick by the fact that we have to give work to the largest number we can. If we want to put to work the skilled workers of the building-trades industry, and I think that would be wise, we ought to do the logical thing, and that is reestablish the P. W. A., which does provide exactly that sort of work. You gentlemen who are fighting this proposed amendment ought to turn around and be for the reestablishment of the P. W. A., and give work to the skilled workers of the building-trades industry, the very thing you are asking for. The P. W. A. would do that. That amendment will be offered, as I understand, and those who are in favor of putting the skilled workers in the building trades to work ought to be the first to support it.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Is it true that we are short of skilled help now?

Mr. KELLER. That is what the gentleman who preceded me said, and I am taking his word for it. He speaks apparently with authority and I accept it as being authoritative.

I call attention to another thing, and that is that the person who has asked for this amendment is not to be accused as a rule of not knowing what he is talking about. That may be a good way to camouflage the question, but it does not answer it. The President has not written a letter along that line without knowing exactly what he wants, and there ought not to be any limitation to the thing that he asks for under present conditions.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the men who have been principally against the W. P. A. along every line, are the ones who are against this amendment. I want to point out there are many men in this body who would destroy the W. P. A. if they could. Everyone of them, so far as I know, are against the Johnson amendment. That ought to receive the attention of the rest of us, who are for the W. P. A. and who know the requirements of this country, to stand up for the amendment to strike off the limitations contained in section 11 of the bill. That is what we ought to do and I call on the men who believe in the W. P. A. and the necessity for it, to vote for the Johnson amendment, as I am going to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDELSTEIN.]

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the opposition to the adoption of the Johnson amendment has primarily been based upon what I consider an undue concern for the interests of one small special group—the general contractors—whose cause was ably presented to the House subcommittee which considered this bill. Although ably presented, I do not believe that they presented sufficient justification for the enactment of a limitation upon W. P. A. projects of \$50,000. Certainly, they presented no case for extending last year's limitation, which applied only to buildings, to construction projects of all types. The reason why I believe that the contractors did not establish their right to receive special consideration at the hands of the House is to be found in what they said and left unsaid before the subcommittee.

The Members who have spoken in opposition to the Johnson amendment and who have favored the granting of what is a special privilege to this small and select group have forgotten that the purpose of this bill is to provide work for the unemployed and not contracts for the contractors. These contractors at no time have come to Congress and asked Congress to grant aid for the benefit of the men whom they discharged when they had no work for them. These contractors did not refrain from investing heavily in labor-saving machinery which enabled them to make more profit through human misery, resulting from unemployment which they caused. These contractors were not concerned with the plight of the unemployed building and construction workers in the cities. They did not come forward and support W. P. A. at any time.

This is what they left unsaid when their representatives, who were able and skillful pleaders, appeared before the House subcommittee. They said they wanted W. P. A., primarily intended to supply work for people who want work, restricted from engaging in construction of buildings, streets, roads, highways, sewers, viaducts, and bridges. They asserted that this restriction was necessary if they were to continue getting contracts. They did not tell the committee that the granting of contracts to them as a result of this restriction would provide as much employment for men as would be provided if W. P. A. were to engage in these projects.

I am not one of those who believe that the only solution for unemployment is to destroy machinery but I am amazed at the callous indifference of those whose heavy investments in machinery caused them to lobby against continuation of the salutary program intended to find work for many hands made idle by machinery. What the real purpose of these gentlemen who are grieved at their inability to continue offering employment if they could not get contracts for public works was revealed by the very clever cross-examination of their representatives by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Reluctantly they were forced to admit that they had greatly diminished their working forces by heavy purchases of labor-saving machinery. It was this idle machinery which really bothered them.

Almost 80 percent of the projects carried on by W. P. A. are construction projects of one kind or another. There can be no denial that all of them are necessary and desirable. There can be no assertion made supported by facts and figures that if it were not for W. P. A. most of these would never get beyond the dream stage. If there were a \$50,000 limitation on such construction work there can be no doubt that W. P. A. would not be able to offer employment to almost 80 percent of the people of its rolls. Certainly very few of the projects in and around large cities would be possible. I doubt whether there are many projects in the City of New York that could be undertaken if section 11 were retained in this bill. Perhaps the General Contractors of America are simply seeking to find contracts for themselves but if they succeed in that purpose they will also succeed in ending W. P. A. whether they intend to or not.

The committee report with respect to section 11 stated that "it has been demonstrated that the larger the structure the lower the proportion of relief labor used on it." There may be a demonstration to that effect, but it is not contained in the hearings on this bill. It is disproved by the projects which W. P. A. has undertaken and successfully

completed. Perhaps the general contractors of America could do the same work at less cost, but it would only be upon the basis of the extensive use of labor-saving machinery. That would pervert the purposes of W. P. A., which is to increase employment of idle labor rather than extend the use of machinery. The very fact that W. P. A. spends more on construction projects shows that it is using relief labor in large numbers on each project.

Mayor LaGuardia of New York City, who as head of the Conference of Mayors has been most active in endeavoring to secure larger appropriations for W. P. A., feels most strongly against the inclusion of section 11. In a telegram sent to the dean of the New York City delegation, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULLEN], the mayor stated his opinion that the inclusion of section 11 in this bill would effectively destroy W. P. A. The President also in his letter indicated his strong opposition to the enactment of section 11 if the W. P. A. program is to be an effective program. Those of us who believe in supporting the President can have no objections, therefore, to voting for the Johnson amendment, which would strike out section 11. That is my opinion, and I therefore urge the adoption of the Johnson amendment, which would strike out the pernicious provisions contained in section 11 of this bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this matter of relief labor on large public works came to my attention last spring, when a young man from my district wrote me a very strong letter saying that he was unable to obtain employment on a certain Public Works project, to wit, a flood-control dam, because there was a paragraph in the contract under which that dam was being built which required that all except the most skilled labor be taken from the relief rolls. I had an investigation made of that clause and found that it was in the contract because a certain proportion of the money was allocated to the construction of that dam from the relief funds. Consequently, when the flood-control appropriation came before us last year, I joined with certain others to strike out any possibility of relief funds being applied to flood-control work, and aided in the addition to the flood-control appropriation of an equivalent amount, so that no one need go on the relief rolls in order to obtain employment on such contracts but those who seek employment can get it when it is available at full wages and full time. There are thousands of people who need jobs but either refuse to go on relief or have not yet been forced on relief.

This afternoon we have been hearing discussion about the general contractors wanting this provision in the bill. I have a number of letters in my hand from several divisions of the American Federation of Labor—namely, the State of California Federation of Labor, the Central Building Trades Council of the city of Los Angeles, and others—very strongly in favor of limiting the value of construction work as the bill now provides with the Ludlow amendment. These are the people who first brought it to the attention of the contractors, in my belief. I know I brought it to their attention and I believe they brought it to the attention of the contractors. I believe the contractors hold a secondary position here, and the prime interest is on the part of the skilled worker who cannot get a job unless he goes on relief.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. I wish the gentleman would tell us just how the contractors expect to get the contracts in those sections of the country where unemployment is rife, as it is in many places.

Mr. HINSHAW. I may say to the gentleman that I am a firm believer in a balanced program for the rehabilitation of our country. I am a firm believer that we must have a certain amount of W. P. A. I also believe we must have some P. W. A., the P. W. A. to take care of the skilled labor on the larger construction projects and the W. P. A. to take care of the unskilled and semi-unemployable labor on projects suitable to their abilities. I do not believe that skilled labor has any place on the W. P. A. They should have jobs at their

trade at full wages and full-time employment as nearly as possible.

Mr. KELLER. I am for that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I fully agree with the gentleman in his statement that the skilled labor should have no preference under W. P. A. It is only reasonable that this be so because we have working on W. P. A. accountants, bank clerks, and other persons who would like to get private employment just as much as skilled labor, but we do not pay those persons the amount of money they were getting when they were working for private interests. Let us treat all alike.

Mr. HINSHAW. Whenever we start a project on P. W. A. it requires some of the services of the categories that the gentleman mentions, accountants, bookkeepers, and so forth, and on such projects any of them are liable to get jobs. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] to strike out section 11.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Celler) there were—ayes 83, noes 78.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 107.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. (a) The various agencies for which appropriations are made in this joint resolution are authorized to receive from sponsors of non-Federal projects contributions in services, materials, or money, such money to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the sponsor and such agencies.

(b) All receipts and collections of Federal agencies by reason of operations in consequence of appropriations made in this joint resolution, except cash contributions of sponsors of projects and amounts credited to revolving funds authorized by this joint resolution, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) Except as authorized in this joint resolution, no allocation of funds shall be made to any other Federal agency from the appropriation in this joint resolution for any Federal agency. No such allocation shall be made for the exercise of the functions of the Radio Division or the United States Film Service transferred to the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the report of the W. P. A. investigators who were sent to Massachusetts, found on page 14 of the hearings, part 3, will be found references to Col. John J. McDonough, the regional director, and George H. Cottell, director of the W. P. A. State office of Massachusetts. The report of the investigators with reference to Colonel McDonough and Mr. Cottell is very unique and interesting, praising Massachusetts for the efficient manner of administration. It places solely as the basis of ability the test of scholastic education, ignoring completely experience, self-education, character, and the other factors that enter into these or any other person's capacity to perform the duties of their office.

The report in respect of these two men is in complete contradistinction to the fact that the United States is still the land of opportunity. If one were to read the minds of the investigators, he would be led to draw the inference that one is not qualified unless he is a graduate of a college. This is a very strange and unusual reasoning to advance in this country. I am confident that the members of the subcommittee do not subscribe to such thoughts and considerations. If lack of scholastic training, such as being a college graduate, were a test for membership in the House of Representatives, I am inclined to think that many Members of the present body would not be here at this time.

I have known Colonel McDonough for 25 years. There is no question of his ability. In the report of the investigators they indicate his case as an illustration of what can be done through political preferment. The direct charge is not

made, but the inference is there. Colonel McDonough never received a political endorsement for any position that he held. I would be the first man who would willingly endorse Colonel McDonough, as his close personal friend of many years and one who knows him for the fine character that he is, yet Colonel McDonough has never asked me for a recommendation. He has never sought any position that he has held. He was loaned to N. R. A. in the first instance by the State department of labor, in which department he held a position of responsibility. Then he was loaned to the W. P. A. He was State director and is now regional director of New England. Every appointment he received was conferred upon him as a result of his own ability. It is true that Colonel McDonough has no college education. It is a good thing to possess a college education, but certainly it is no offense in America for anyone to proceed up the ladder of life without possessing a college education.

Colonel McDonough, as an employee of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, studied law at nighttime and passed the bar in 1913. He has also taken special courses at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He typifies the land of opportunity of which we are citizens. He is a self-educated and self-made man. His character and reputation are of the highest. The report of the investigators, with its intimations, are unfair and unwarranted. It is true that later in the hearings Colonel Harrington's report is made a part of the hearings, but they are not made a part of the record at the point in the hearings where the report of the investigator is found.

It is unfortunate that the subcommittee did not give these men an opportunity of personally appearing before them, in order that the full picture would have been obtained, instead of permitting such a report to be made, incomplete and unfair as it is. The subcommittee would have been greatly impressed by both Colonel McDonough and Mr. Cottell. These men value their character and reputation just as much as does any Member of this body.

Since Colonel McDonough has been State administrator, or during the period that he was, he was charged with the responsibility of spending around \$400,000,000 of W. P. A. funds, and as the record shows in a highly commendable manner. The investigator's report shows that Massachusetts has had a clean administration under all administrators. As regional director of New England he has had the supervision of many more millions of dollars. He has performed his duties as regional director in an equally highly commendable manner.

Colonel McDonough saw service at the Mexican border from June 27, 1916, to October 19, 1916, Battery D, First Massachusetts National Guard.

In the World War he enlisted as private on January 18, 1918; took examination for commission, Camp Sherman, in August 1918; given commission as first lieutenant January 9, 1919; at present time has commission as lieutenant colonel, United States Army Quartermaster Reserve.

Appointed regional director in February 1939; held position as regional director and State administrator for Massachusetts until August 1939.

Position as regional director for region 1 included six New England States.

As State administrator for Massachusetts had full charge of the activities of the W. P. A., with an employment quota as high as 134,000.

State director of employment for Work Projects Administration in charge of all labor policies for the State, with reference to hours of work, wages, and classification of labor, both manual and "white collar".

When he came to the W. P. A. in Massachusetts, it was on a loan basis from the Massachusetts State Department of Labor and Industries.

Chief inspector's salary, department of labor and industries, was \$2,880. Now the minimum salary is \$3,000 to \$3,540 for this position.

He is still on leave of absence.

As chief inspector, department of labor and industries, the chief duties were to supervise an inspection force of 40 who visit daily all of the industrial establishments in Massachusetts so that in normal work, 84,000 establishments would have been visited annually and check made as to labor laws, safeguarding machines, lighting conditions, occupational hazards, illegal employment, and so forth.

National Recovery Administration as Labor Compliance Officer—borrowed from State Department of Labor and Industries—had charge of enforcement of all labor provisions of the Code, with an inspection force.

Later promoted to position of State Director of N. R. A. for Massachusetts, with full charge of labor and enforcement of all codes in the State.

Positions of industrial health inspector for the State of Massachusetts; health inspector, water inspector, and foreman of construction and sanitary inspector for the city of Boston were all secured through competitive examinations.

While it is true that Colonel McDonough is not a graduate of a college, he is self-made, and is a real graduate of the college of hard knocks. A graduate of a high school, he was compelled, as many have been, to go to work. Later, he attended nights, and in his spare moments, Burdett College at Boston, a business college; and took special courses in other schools. From 1909 to 1912 he studied law nighttimes, and in his spare moments, and passed the examination held in 1913 for admission to the Massachusetts bar. He was admitted to practice law in Massachusetts in 1913, the United States district courts in 1914. Even as late as 1935 and 1936 he has taken special courses of studies.

As a matter of fact, while not intended by the report, the report constitutes the finest compliment that could be paid to Colonel McDonough.

What I have said with reference to Colonel McDonough equally applies to Mr. Cottell, a man who is a self-educated gentleman, a man who is eminently qualified to fill the position that he now occupies. He is self-educated and self-made. Like countless others, he has taken advantage of the opportunity that exists here, and is to be congratulated for that fact. Instead of the investigator's gratuitous and unwarranted reference to his education, they should have highly complimented him for his determination to equip himself, through self-education and experience, as he has, for the holding of responsible positions. He has performed the duties of his office in an able and effective manner.

The following shows, in a general way, the various positions that Mr. Cottell has held in the past, and in the positions under the Works Progress Administration:

1911-26—building-construction industry: Positions held: Laborer, apprentice electrician, journeyman electrician, foreman electrician, construction foreman.

1926-33: Business manager for Local Union No. 437, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Summary of duties: Responsible to the local union and the international office for results in organizing the electrical workers in the territory. Responsible for establishing friendly relations with employers. Charge of collection of dues, handling of all correspondence, keeping of such statistics as required by the international office.

1933-35: General organizer for the American Federation of Labor, also representative for the United Textile Workers of America.

Summary of duties: Organizing textile workers; representing workers at hearings held before textile boards established under the National Recovery Act; maintaining friendly relations with employers.

The following positions were held on the work program:

October 23, 1935: Employment Division, W. P. A. area No. 4, assistant supervisor.

February 1, 1936: Employment Division, W. P. A. area No. 4, section chief.

July 1, 1936: Employment Division, W. P. A. area No. 4, section chief.

November 10, 1936: Employment Division, W. P. A. area No. 4, district supervisor.

July 16, 1937: Employment Division, Fall River, supervisor.

March 16, 1938: W. P. A. State office, acting assistant director.

June 1, 1938: W. P. A. State office, assistant director.

June 16, 1938: W. P. A. State office, assistant director.

July 20, 1938: W. P. A. State office, acting director.

January 1, 1939: W. P. A. State office, director.

Nonpaying positions held in the American Federation of Labor: Vice president, Massachusetts State Association of Electrical Workers, from 1929 to present time. Membership, 8,000.

President, Fall River Central Labor Union, for past 6 years. Average membership, 15,000.

Former president, Fall River Building Trades Council; honorary president of this organization at the present time. Average membership, 3,500.

While I have not known Mr. Cottell very long, since his connection with the W. P. A., I do know that he is recognized as very efficient, and that he performs the duties of his position in an able manner. I have the highest feelings of respect for him, personally and as an official of the W. P. A. He is eminently fitted to perform the duties of his office and has equipped himself for greater responsibilities.

The investigators have certainly, expressing myself in the plain language of the day, pulled "a boner" in both of these cases. I hope that this will be a lesson to them so that they will not place themselves in a similar position in the future.

I also hope the subcommittee in directing its investigators in the future, if any investigations are made, will caution them to make no report that because one is not possessed of college training or scholastic training that satisfies their own minds, that of itself that means the individual is not qualified to fill any position in the service of our Federal Government. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 13. Agencies receiving appropriations under this joint resolution are authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes for which such appropriations are made.

Sec. 14 (a) The Commissioner shall fix a monthly earning schedule for persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part from funds appropriated by section 1 which shall not substantially affect the current national average labor cost per person of the Work Projects Administration. Such monthly earning schedule shall not be varied for workers of the same type in different geographical areas to any greater extent than may be justified by differences in the cost of living. The Commissioner shall require that the hours of work for all persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part by funds appropriated by section 1 shall (1) be 130 hours per month except that the Commissioner, in his discretion, may require a lesser number of hours of work per month in the case of relief workers with no dependents and the earnings of such workers shall be correspondingly reduced, and (2) not exceed 8 hours in any day and (3) not exceed 40 hours in any week.

(b) The Commissioner may authorize exemptions from the above limitations of monthly earnings and hours of work to protect work already done on a project; to permit making up lost time; in the case of an emergency involving the public welfare; and in the case of supervisory personnel employed on work projects.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Page 18, line 11, after the word "living", insert: "The Work Projects Administrator is hereby directed to rescind all monthly wage cuts to unskilled workers on the program that have been made since July 1, 1939, and to raise the national average labor cost per person by the amount necessary to rescind such monthly wage cuts to unskilled workers on the program."

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the Committee will pay close attention to the figures I am going to give in connection with this amendment.

This amendment would restore to low-paid W. P. A. workers the cuts in their monthly income made last year. Here is the situation. When the Congress passed last June the new monthly wage basis, increases in W. P. A. wages were made in the South and certain border States to unskilled workers. General increases in wages were made to semi-skilled and skilled workers. But cuts in wages were made to many hundreds of thousands of unskilled workers in the North, East, and West. Particularly hard hit and particu-

larly unjustifiable were the cuts made to women on the sewing and other projects.

Semiskilled workers getting \$58 were increased to \$68; some getting \$50 were increased to \$62; some getting \$33 were increased to \$52. Among skilled workers the increases were just as substantial. Workers getting \$72 were increased to \$89; others getting \$60 were increased to \$81; others getting \$63 were increased to \$79.

But what happened to the poor unskilled? Workers only getting \$57 were cut to \$52; others getting \$60 were cut to \$57. This is among the men. Among the women the cut was worse. W. P. A. decided to put the women in a sort of B classification. So those getting \$60 were cut to \$52; those getting \$57 were cut to \$48; others getting \$48 were cut to \$42, and so on. It was discrimination against the unskilled workers. It would require just as much for the family of an unskilled worker to live, of course, as would be required by the family of a skilled worker.

This just does not make sense. No justification has ever been made for these cuts, except the necessity of W. P. A. to mechanically comply with the law. If Colonel Harrington found that a mechanical compliance with the law required these cuts, then let us take the necessary action so that these low-paid workers will not be further compelled to live on such a low standard as to even make it impossible to keep body and soul together.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has well stated the problem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, May 16, on page 6274. He shows that in his district cuts were made as high as \$17.50 a month. In other words, laborers working for \$60 were cut to \$42.50 in this district.

The amendments would take care of the situation which occurs in many of these northern, eastern, and western congressional districts. The semiskilled and skilled, of course, were not given any more than what they should have received.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Can the gentleman inform the House just how much money it would take to pay back these widows who have been working in the sewing rooms and the like whose salaries have been cut?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I can say to the gentleman that it would not require a great sum of money. I cannot give the gentleman the exact figure. It is pitiable to realize the amount of money these poor women are working for. I went into the sewing projects in my district last fall and I found them producing very, very serviceable clothing of all kinds. They nearly mobbed me to tell me about the unjust cuts of their wages made by the W. P. A. in connection with these projects. Their complaints were just and right.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. O'DAY. In my State of New York the cuts in the sewing projects have caused more suffering to the unskilled workers and to the poor who received the clothes that were made by those workers than any other cuts.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And the cuts in the city of New York range from \$5 to \$9 a month.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In my district they cut the heads of families down to \$39 a month.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That was general all over the country. It is an absolute discrimination and I appeal to the membership of this House to do what is right by the unskilled worker, both men and women.

Let us be reasonable and recognize what we have done to the poor W. P. A. worker in the last year. First we took away his prevailing wage rate and asked him to work 130 hours per month for the same wage. So in my State, the hourly pay of unskilled workers was reduced by about 30 percent.

Next, we gave the workers the 18-month clause, which meant that they were dropped from the program for 1 to 3 or 4 months. In many cases, as Colonel Harrington's report indicates, they had terrible difficulty in getting either private employment or relief. Most of them did finally get back, but we must recognize that this 18-month clause meant another pay cut, when you average it over a year.

Then we slapped this reduction in monthly wages on hundreds of thousands of the unskilled poorly paid workers. Then, in addition, hundreds of thousands lost more time and pay this winter due to the inclement weather.

And so we have been knocking the poor W. P. A. workers around, depriving them of their miserable security, and complain when they do not do all the work we expected. Do you think that treating W. P. A. workers that way—giving them an annual wage of perhaps \$500 a year—you are going to get \$1,500 worth of work out of them. Let us give these workers the money necessary to buy the decencies of life, and the first step is to rescind these wage cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. O'CONNOR)—ayes 46, noes 76.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana demands tellers. All in favor of taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Seventeen Members, not a sufficient number, the tellers are refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: Page 18 after (a), in line 3, strike out down through the word "living", in line 11, and insert: "The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the appropriations in this title shall be not less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Work Projects Administration: *Provided*, That if minimum rates of pay for persons employed by private employers in any occupation are established by or pursuant to the authority conferred by any Labor Standards Act enacted at the third session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, not less than the minimum rates of pay so established shall be paid to persons in similar occupations in the same locality employed on projects under funds appropriated by section 1."

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, on Thursday, May 16, I informed the Members of the House that the Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration is discriminating against my people of the Thirteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania by placing in effect a wage scale set up on a population basis, contrary to the spirit and letter of the Emergency Relief Act of 1939.

I supported this contention with a communication from Commissioner Harrington's office, advising that wage scales had been placed under four categories according to counties on the basis of the 1930 population. With the discretionary powers granted to the Commissioner, and which the terms of this resolution would continue, I have no doubt but that this same policy of discrimination would be carried on, for to date my pleas with the Administration to rectify the situation in my district have fallen on deaf ears.

This wage scale fixed by the Commissioner after August 31, 1939, on a county population basis, cut the W. P. A. workers in my district from \$60 a month to \$42.50—starvation wages. This action was taken because the Commissioner placed my district in his "C" or third category group, which was the designation given for a district in which, to quote the written advice from the Commissioner was "according to counties in which the 1930 population of the largest municipality was from 5,000 to 25,000."

Permit me to further show the inconsistency and discriminatory result of this policy by the Work Projects Commissioner.

In January of this year I asked Col. Philip Mathews, Pennsylvania Administrator, to furnish me with a list showing the minimum wage rate paid for laborer's classification in each of the 67 counties of Pennsylvania.

Accordingly I received copies of the State administrator's orders, Nos. W-267 through W-270, establishing the schedule of monthly earnings for project workers in accordance with General Order No. 1 of the Federal Work Projects Administration.

Much to my amazement, the State administrators' orders Nos. W-269 and W-270, in accordance with letters dated November 1 and December 16, 1939, from Mr. Fred R. Rauch, assistant to Commissioner Harrington, authorized an adjustment in the schedule of monthly earnings for 5 communities in a certain county of Pennsylvania, with the population of these communities being 800, 994, 2,516, 13,057, and 13,290, and placing these areas in the metropolitan wage group. The largest community in that county has a population of 19,544, and the total population of the county is only 198,542.

Compare this with the wage scale set up by Commissioner Harrington for my district, part of which is Schuylkill County, with one community having 24,300, or just 700 less than the figure required by Commissioner Harrington to place it in a higher wage bracket; another with 21,782, another with over 14,000, and still another with over 12,000; and the total population of the county is 235,505. In Northumberland County only a street separates Shamokin Borough, with 20,274, and Coal Township, with 19,929. Mount Carmel has 17,967, and Sunbury 15,626.

The Commissioner did not place my district in the metropolitan-area wage bracket. No; he gave the unfortunate relief workers of my district a 27-percent wage cut.

Why was one county in Pennsylvania, with the largest city having a population of only 19,544 and total population of 198,542, placed under the highest wage schedule, when my district, with the largest city having a population of 24,300 and total county population of 235,505, placed in a third classification group with a 27-percent wage cut?

Gentlemen, if we cannot agree that this is discrimination upon the part of the Work Projects Commissioner, then we have lost our sense of fairness and justice. If we do agree, then it is imperative that we remove the discretionary power granted the W. P. A. Commissioner by eliminating the provisions of this proposed resolution which would result in a continuance of present conditions by adopting a prevailing rate of wage for W. P. A. workers.

I implore you to rectify this situation by striking out, under section 14 (a), lines 3 to 11 to the end of the word "living", and insert in lieu thereof—

The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the appropriations in this title shall be not less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Work Projects Administration: *Provided*, That if minimum rates of pay for persons employed by private employers in any occupation are established by or pursuant to the authority conferred by any labor-standards act enacted at the third session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, not less than the minimum rates of pay so established shall be paid to persons in similar occupations in the same locality employed on projects under funds appropriated by section 1.

No doubt the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will contend that 300,000 or more will be removed from W. P. A. if my amendment is adopted. But I want to remind the gentleman and the Appropriations Committee that if my amendment is adopted the work could be carried on by increasing the appropriation or by bringing in a deficiency appropriation.

There has been much talk of higher wages. My amendment will not only rectify an unjust and intolerable policy of the Work Projects Administration, but gives every Member here the opportunity to show that he is opposed to unfair and starvation wages as paid in my district by the Government to the man and his family dependent upon work relief for a livelihood. I plead with you to support this justified amendment to the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I arise at this time in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] because it will restore the W. P. A. wage scale in effect September 1, 1939; thereby giving the lowest paid W. P. A. worker \$53.30 monthly instead of the \$39 he is now receiving. This amendment likewise provides for a proportionate increase to other groups in the unskilled class.

Last June, when the House was considering the Emergency Relief Act of 1939, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] offered the following amendment:

Such monthly earning schedule shall not be varied for workers of the same type in different geographical areas to any greater extent than may be justified by differences in the cost of living.

This language is identical with paragraph 1, section 14 (a), of the Joint Resolution No. 544 now before us.

In considering the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], on June 16 the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee who was in charge of the relief bill, made the following statement:

I do not know what the effect of this amendment may be.

His views were shared by the majority of the Members of this House at that time who in the absence of authentic information were fearful that the amendment would not only decrease wages but at the same time would reduce the number of jobs on W. P. A. under the appropriation requested.

Sensing what I believed to be rank injustice to my constituents in central Pennsylvania, and being determined that the wage scale in effect was a mere pittance and could ill-afford any further reduction, I joined 158 colleagues in defeating the Tarver amendment. The defeat administered was short lived because of the action taken by the Senate in adopting the amendment. As a result of the Senate's action and at the insistence of Colonel Harrington, W. P. A. Administrator, the conference committee sustained the Senate action with the result that when both Houses were asked to finally consider the relief bill they were denied any further consideration other than a mere vote as to the refusal or acceptance of the entire bill.

On September 1, 1939, as a result of the Tarver amendment, which is now part and parcel of this year's relief bill, Colonel Harrington put into effect his interpretation of that amendment with the result that thousands of W. P. A. workers throughout the Nation, and particularly in the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, felt the ill-effects of this administrative action to such a pronounced degree that rank discrimination and needless suffering followed.

As an example, let me cite you the difference in wage scales that prevails in my tricounty district of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties in Pennsylvania.

Prior to September 1, 1939, the unskilled laborer received \$53.30 monthly and under the present wage scale he may find himself in class B of the unskilled group receiving a mere \$39. The following schedule contains a comparative table of the old and new wage scales:

Pennsylvania

	Unskilled		Inter-mediate	Skilled	Professional and technical
	B	A			
Blair County, Altoona, 82,054 (25,000 to 100,000):					
Wages established by Executive order in 1935.....	\$52.00	\$60.00	\$75.00	\$83.00	
Prior to Sept. 1, 1939.....	57.20	66.30	75.40	83.20	
New rates.....	\$48.10	52.00	62.40	81.90	84.50
Centre County, Bellefonte, 4,804 (under 5,000):					
Wages established by Executive order in 1935.....	40.00	45.00	55.00	61.00	
Prior to Sept. 1, 1939.....	53.30	61.10	70.20	78.00	
New rates.....	39.00	42.90	52.00	67.60	68.90
Clearfield County, DuBois, 11,595 (5,000 to 25,000):					
Wages established by Executive order in 1935.....	44.00	50.00	63.00	69.00	
Prior to Sept. 1, 1939.....	53.30	61.10	70.20	78.00	
New rates.....	42.90	48.10	57.20	74.10	76.70

When the W. P. A. worker was informed he must accept a reduction in pay from \$53.30 to \$39, naturally he wrote his Congressman asking for an explanation as to the reason for such action. It was not difficult for me to understand the situation faced by the head of a family who was expected to support and educate a family on a meager \$39 a month.

Hence, I contacted Colonel Harrington, who, in turn, referred me to Colonel Philip Mathews, Pennsylvania State administrator of W. P. A., only to be informed by that official that such wage scales were based upon the cost of living as directed by the Tarver amendment. In desperation, I appealed to President Roosevelt on behalf of the W. P. A. workers, only to be again referred to Colonel Harrington. In other words, it reminded one of the wheel referred to and operated by Major Bowes on his nationally known radio program, when he says:

Round and round she goes, and where it stops nobody knows.

Seriously, gentlemen, let us consider an unemployed coal miner, railroader, brickyarder, or a worker from countless other occupations who finds himself forced to the W. P. A. rolls to provide a livelihood for his loved ones. Faced with a desperate situation and a problem that permits no easy solution, it is evident to any fair-thinking individual that such citizens with growing children cannot properly provide and raise a family on \$39 monthly.

We have no greater authority for such a statement than the Bureau of Home Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture who from the Consumers Purchases Study conducted by them points out that any family whose average size is 3.3 persons requires an annual income of \$750 a year from the bare necessities of life. It is further stated by the Bureau of Home Economics that families who have an income of less than \$750 annually are not only denied a bare living but from their low income are face to face with the fact that rent, food, fuel, light, and medical care require \$704 alone, therefore on an income of less than \$750 they do not break even, but in truth face a deficit.

It should be borne in mind that, with few exceptions, this \$39 monthly wage scale is decreased on an average of \$4 monthly, due to the worker having to pay his own transportation cost to and from the project.

Another evil of the ruthless reduction in wages is the discrimination between adjoining counties in the maintaining of a different wage scale, when it is an undisputed fact that rent, clothing, and food supplies are identical in price in these various communities. How can any reasonable man answer a W. P. A. employee receiving \$39 a month when across the county line his fellow W. P. A. worker receives \$42.90, and both men deal at the same store and pay the same price for a pound of butter or a peck of potatoes?

I know some of you say that the W. P. A. rolls are filled with people who are always unemployed in good or bad times, but I refuse to permit indictment of the vast number of worthy citizens who, from the effects of widespread economic conditions, find it necessary to accept employment on the W. P. A. in order to secure a livelihood.

I know, too, that some of you will say, if the W. P. A. worker receiving \$39 monthly is returned to the former wage scale of \$53.30 monthly the increased cost will result in a reduction of jobs. But let me remind you, a moment ago my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] offered an amendment that would have increased the \$975,650,000 to \$1,125,000,000, and the increase was more than sufficient to cover any increase necessary in restoring the old wage scale in effect prior to September 1, 1939. In spite of this effort to increase the amount for next year, when a vote was taken on the Ditter amendment, let me emphasize this fact, not one Democratic Member of this House voted for the amendment; in other words, they defeated our efforts to increase the wages of the W. P. A. worker.

Now in all seriousness, gentlemen, the Fenton amendment now being considered offers another opportunity to grant an increase to the W. P. A. worker, and thereby correct the abuses that have been heaped upon this class of worthy citizens.

Last year I vigorously opposed the Tarver amendment which resulted in the unjust wage reduction in effect the past year.

In considering this year's bill I am supporting every amendment that will increase the present wage scale, and I propose to continue my action in simple justice to the thousands of

W. P. A. workers who have been the victims of such rank discrimination.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes it necessary to dismiss 300,000 persons. It should be noted that the gentleman's amendment applies only to the first paragraph of the section, but makes no change in the hours of labor. If you will examine the testimony before the committee as it appears on page 1228 of the hearing, you will see from the tabular statement submitted by Colonel Harrington that such an increase as is proposed by the amendment without change of hours could only be accomplished through the discharge of 300,000 workmen.

May I also call your attention to the statement of Colonel Harrington as quoted in the report. He says that this change brought about the greatest single improvement in the operation and administration of the program that has been accomplished since its inception.

Let us go a little further. Read what Colonel Somervell had to say on this point. And he makes this statement after he has had opportunity to observe at length its operation in New York City. He said:

After the first opposing reaction of skilled and professional workers, who had relied on off-time to supplement their Work Projects Administration earnings, production per man-month increased rapidly, morale, general attention to duty, and the whole atmosphere on the projects showed a noticeable upswing. This permitted more work to be done by a given number of employees. Thus, not only was the total amount of work done increased but the task of assigning and directing it, and paying for it was greatly simplified. There has been no indication of any effect whatsoever of this proviso on wages in private industry.

This shows the futility, the mistaken purpose of the amendment itself.

Further, it defeats the purpose for which it is offered. Here is a statement in the report, on page 10:

It (the provision) resulted in an increased cost in the national average labor cost of W. P. A. of between \$1.50 and \$2 in monthly wages.

A vote for this amendment is a vote to fire 300,000 and take away the support of 300,000 families.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets that the time has been limited and has been allotted, under which circumstances the Chair is unable to recognize the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I have the 2 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I reserve the balance of my time to use on some subsequent amendment to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets that the time has all been assigned.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FENTON) there were ayes 41 and noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Page 18, line 3, strike out all of section 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 14. Work on all projects shall be paid at hourly rates of wages equal to those prevailing for similar work in the locality or to the union scale of wages where such scale obtains for such work in such locality. Monthly wage scales shall be fixed so that the national average monthly wage shall not be less than \$70 monthly; nor shall the monthly scale in any locality for any type of work be less than \$40 a month. The hours of work shall not be less than 120 nor more than 130 hours monthly."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would establish the works program on a new basis, that of a real works program instead of a relief program. The gentleman from Virginia, Congressman WOODRUM, has

well pointed out the inconsistency of a work-relief program. It is neither fish, fowl, nor good red herring. The gentleman from Virginia, Congressman WOODRUM, proposes that we ditch the W. P. A. and plump for just a P. W. A. This is not necessary. It is possible to reform the W. P. A. and get all the advantages of the P. W. A. type, and keep it a Federal-State program.

After all, there is no reason why W. P. A. must be a relief program with relief wages, relief standards, relief morale. It is that aspect of the program which has operated against absorbing W. P. A. workers into private industry. As a matter of fact, not only do they have the barrier of prejudice against them, but actually the low standard of living under which they must live makes them almost unemployable after a period.

For example, compare the study of living costs by W. P. A. itself with the W. P. A. wage scale.

W. P. A. in its cost-of-living study has two living-cost standards. One is maintenance living cost, which means just getting by; the other is emergency standard, which it defines as that standard at which it is dangerous to live for any period of time.

Let us compare this emergency standard with W. P. A. wages.

In Butte, Mont., the emergency standard for a family of four is \$77 a month. The W. P. A. wage is \$48 for women and \$52 for men. In other words, the worker has to live on 20 percent to 30 percent less than an emergency standard. In Cleveland the emergency standard is \$80 a month. W. P. A. workers get \$52 to \$57 a month. In Boston the emergency standard is also \$80, and the W. P. A. wage is also \$25 to \$30 a month lower. The same could be cited for almost any city in the country, north, east, south, and west.

For the country as a whole the emergency standard averages \$75 a month; which I repeat is that standard upon which it is dangerous to live for any length of time.

Now let us see what happened to a worker's wages at present. I have selected Buffalo, N. Y., as an example, because its emergency cost of living—\$75 a month—is exactly the same as the national average.

A W. P. A. worker in Buffalo may get either \$52–\$57 a month, depending upon whether he is a man or a woman. Let us average it at \$54 a month which is the national average.

How does he spend his \$54? Food at the emergency level would take \$28 a month. Rent at the emergency level would take \$13.95. That totals about \$42 a month. Clothing would require \$11 a month. That means \$1 a month could be left for fuel, ice, household supplies, furniture, medical care, transportation, school attendance, insurance, church, and other associations, and recreation. You know that this cannot be done. What happens? The W. P. A. worker cannot afford even the emergency standard of the W. P. A. study for food, or for rent. He has to eat the worst of food, live in the worst of slums, going downhill day after day, month after month.

The amendment would increase the average W. P. A. wage to \$70 a month. It would, therefore, still be \$5 a month less than this emergency standard of living. What would happen if this were done; what would happen to this extra pay? Would it go up the flue, or be invested in stocks and bonds? The record will show that it would be used to buy food, pay rent, buy clothing, household goods, generally to stimulate trade in a wholesome, peacetime basis.

The workers would have a higher morale, a better health; they would be able to do better work; the program would be more respected, and the workers more sought after by private industry. The Federal Government would be setting a good example, and not a bad example to industry as is now being done.

This would not in any way harm the wage level in the South. Rather it would increase it; for the amendment provides for a minimum wage of \$40 a month. In the South, the minimum is still as low as \$30 a month.

The other part of the amendment refers to the hourly pay and the hours of work. The amendment proposes that we restore the prevailing hourly wage, in conformity with the

policy proposed of making this a real works program. Today the W. P. A. is the only works activity that the Federal Government participates in, that does not pay prevailing wages. The Federal Government insists upon the prevailing wage for P. W. A., housing, and State-road work; insists upon it in Government contracts. W. P. A. is the one lone exception, and this is a Federally directed agency. This is inconsistent and hypocritical.

The amendment proposes that we pay the prevailing hourly wage, the union scale, and make the hours of labor 120 to 130 a month, depending upon local conditions. This is supported by the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the Workers Alliance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COFFEE of Washington) there were—ayes 25, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOOK: Amend section 14 (a), page 18, line 11, by inserting after the words "difference in the cost of living" the following words: "Provided, That adjacent counties being in the same geographical area having similar climatic conditions in a State and having similar living costs, but which do not have concentrated populated cities, be given similar monthly earning schedules."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, the arguments advanced by the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania apply equally to this amendment.

The argument made by the gentleman from Missouri against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not apply here. Not one person would have to be taken off the relief rolls. All this amendment would do would be to provide a similar wage scale in counties that have similar living conditions, similar climatic conditions and that are in the same geographical area. This would certainly take care of a bad situation in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. For instance, there are 8 counties in my district. In 4 of these counties there are cities of over 5,000 population and in those 4 counties the W. P. A. worker receives \$48.10 per month. In the other 4 counties there are no communities over 5,000 population and the W. P. A. worker receives only \$39. Previous to the last schedule set up by the W. P. A. they all received \$44 a month.

It is discrimination pure and simple, because in one of the counties we have 5 mining communities. That is the county of Iron. In some places there only a street separates them. This subdivision was brought about by the large mining companies to avoid taxation. Now you are penalizing the people still further by this discriminatory schedule. The combined population is 10,000, yet in that county a W. P. A. worker can receive only \$39 a month, whereas the man across the street in the next county, a man working in the same ditch with him, receives \$42.90.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yet the cost of butter is the same to both.

Mr. HOOK. Living conditions are exactly the same.

I hope this amendment is agreed to.

If you will look on page 433 of the hearings you will find a gross discrimination. You will notice that the country is divided into three wage regions. One is the East and Middle West, which includes the States of Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

No. 2 wage region includes Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

No. 3 wage region: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

If this is not one of the most cockeyed methods of handling this situation, I have never heard of one. Whoever figured that out must have had a Ouija board at his or her disposal because only a person with their eyes closed and their mind a blank could have arrived at such a nonsensical conclusion.

Since when have the people of the West been entitled to be singled out and blessed. I have heard of the Golden West where it costs less to live high, but the W. P. A. does not believe what the westerners say as to their section.

It costs just as much and more to live in my section as it does in any other section. It costs as much to live in the Upper Peninsula as it does to live in Detroit, Los Angeles, or New York. I hope that this matter will be straightened out. I hope you see fit to adopt my amendment. If you do not do it this afternoon the fight will not stop here because I will carry it to the other body and ask that it be inserted there.

Let us pass this amendment now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hook) there were—ayes 25, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hook: Page 18, line 15, strike out all after the comma following the word "Commissioner" down to and including the word "month", in line 17, and insert in lieu thereof "shall require a lesser number of hours of work, not to exceed 65 hours per month."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, if the committee wants to save money and yet have the money it grants more equitably distributed they should accept this amendment. At the present time single men without dependents employed by W. P. A. work the same number of hours as a married man with five or six children and receives the same amount of money although he has only himself to feed and clothe. This amendment would require that the Commissioner employ a single man not more than 65 hours a month. It would give the single man only one-half as much time as the family man, and it would give an opportunity to employ twice as many single men with the same amount of money. At present some single men get nothing and others get all. On the other hand, the money saved could be used to give employment to married men with dependents and could be distributed among the workers who are heads of families. It certainly would give the W. P. A. the opportunity to take care of more married men. I feel that the heads of families are entitled to more than single men without dependents. I am certain that even the single men will agree with this amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This is a relief bill. It has always appeared to me that the amount of relief extended should be based on the cost of living in the community where the worker resides, and the number of dependents which he has to support.

Mr. HOOK. That is right.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It is absolutely ridiculous to spend money through a relief bill and give the same amount to single men as is given to married men and heads of families.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman is correct. If we are to give married men the amount of relief they are entitled to, we must cut down the time allotted to single men or else increase the appropriation. I voted for an increase yesterday, but that was defeated. The heads of families should have greater consideration. At the same time employment should be spread out to a greater number.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a good amendment and ought to be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hook) there were—ayes 40, noes 36.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers. Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. Hook to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 66, noes 61.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEYER of California: Amend section 14 by adding the following subsection:

"(c) No worker who has lost time through no fault of his own shall be denied compensation for such loss of time. Where a worker is available for work and is prevented from working through no fault of his own there shall be no deduction from his monthly pay check."

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, under the present law, and the way it is interpreted, a W. P. A. worker who loses time through no fault of his own usually suffers great hardship. We know that W. P. A. workers are chosen because they are in need and have no financial resources. We pay them a so-called security wage which is far, far below a decent standard of living. We make them work 130 hours a month for that inadequate wage. We lay them off for a period of 1 to 3 months on the 18-month clause, or on the frequent reductions of quota.

Now, we inflict another injustice which should be remedied. Last winter, for example, the severe weather conditions forced the cessation of operation on many projects. Day after day snow and cold prevented workers from working. What happened at the end of the pay periods? The workers found themselves with checks amounting to half or a quarter of their security wage. What were they to live on? How were they to keep themselves in condition to do a day's work? W. P. A. threw up its hands. It said it had no power to help these people. At this time, when their need for food, clothing, fuel, and so forth, was greatest, their income stopped. For some of them in desperate straits the surplus commodities supplied foods equal to 1 cent or 1½ cents a meal per person.

The record will show in last January and February alone W. P. A. workers lost a total of nearly \$30,000,000 in pay, due to this situation, and this was equal to \$12.50 for each and every W. P. A. worker on the program. We understand that the workers are still today trying to make up that lost time.

Now, W. P. A. has more responsibility in this than it has assumed. If W. P. A. does not have power to do anything, we should give it the power to handle this problem properly. The amendment would make it possible for W. P. A. to assure to workers a full pay check if they were ready to work and were prevented through no fault of their own. Then the W. P. A. could make any provision necessary to have the time made up later on. But, for heaven's sake, let us not penalize the poor W. P. A. worker if the project closes because of inclement weather. Let us not take away his meager pay at the time when he needs it most. We pauperize him. Give him less than a living wage, and the very time of the year, when it is cold and the families need this meager wage the most, they are denied it. These people would be required to make up the time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER].

Mr. Chairman, this is the most absurd amendment that has been offered to the bill up to this time, and that is a rather strong statement in view of some of the proposals considered here today. The bill already provides that men

can make up work lost for any of the reasons suggested in the amendment. This proposition would pay them whether they work or not and, of course, too often they would not. It proposes an arrangement which private industry could not possibly countenance. The amendment does not warrant consideration, much less adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GEYER of California) there were—ayes 4, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SECCOMBE: Page 18, line 11, after the word "living", insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That in no case shall the monthly earning schedule for workers of the same type vary more than 5 percent."

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. Hook] and his amendment were misunderstood a few minutes ago when he said he desired to provide some differential in the wage rate pertaining to the W. P. A. I want to draw a paradox in my own congressional district. I have three wage rates. I have laborers making \$39, \$42.90, and \$52. The district is separated by the main artery of the small community. There was a project on which the men on one side of the street received \$39 a month, while men on the other side, working on the same project, received \$52, and in one instance they were all dealing at the same grocery store. I do not think anyone wants laborers on the W. P. A. receiving different pay for the same job.

We talk about Communists, we talk about radicals, although some years ago we talked about Bolsheviks. We have streamlined that term and we call them radicals or Communists today. If we are doing anything at all, we are breaking down the morale of these men every day by a differential in wage rates for doing the same kind of work on the same job. Nobody in an office nor nobody in a factory, and certainly no Member of Congress, would want to differentiate as between men doing the same job. Certainly you would not want to differentiate in this body between men. We want to hire men on a W. P. A. project and we ought to pay them the same rate of pay when doing the same work. We do not want to say that Baptists or Methodists are the only ones who can be employed. Here we have a differential, and I plead with you to agree to this amendment, which states that there shall not be a differential of over 5 percent for people doing the same kind of work.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SECCOMBE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOOK. I think the gentleman's amendment is a very worthy one and should be agreed to.

Mr. SECCOMBE. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think it is apparent to anyone who listened to the reading of the amendment that the change proposed by the gentleman would completely wreck the differential system, which has been adopted after long experience and careful consideration—a system which is working admirably and should not be disturbed. I hope the House will consider the far-reaching effect of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECCOMBE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SECCOMBE) there were—ayes 45, noes 75.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers. Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 15. (a) In employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be determined, as far as practicable, on the basis of relative needs and shall, where the relative needs are found to be the same, be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and Span-

ish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration), unmarried widows of such veterans, and wives of such veterans, who are in need and are American citizens; and (2) other American citizens, Indians, and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need.

(b) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers, excepting veterans, who have been continuously employed on such projects for more than 18 months, and any relief worker so removed shall be ineligible to be restored to employment on such projects until after (a) the expiration of 30 days after the date of his removal, and (b) recertification of his eligibility for restoration to employment on such projects.

(c) In considering employment of persons upon work projects prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution, the agency providing the employment shall determine whether such persons are able to perform the work on work projects to which they can be assigned and no person shall be employed or retained for employment on any such project whose work habits are such or work record shows that he is incapable of performing satisfactorily the work to which he may be assigned on the project.

(d) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers whose needs for employment have not been certified by, and, except as provided in section 16 (b), no relief worker shall be employed on such projects until after his need for employment has been certified by (a) a local public certifying agency or (b) the Work Projects Administration where no such agency exists or where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept certification by local public agencies.

(e) No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and no part of the money appropriated in this joint resolution shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship.

(f) The Commissioner shall cause a periodic investigation to be made of the rolls of relief employees on work projects, and shall eliminate from the rolls those not in actual need, such investigation to be made so that each case is investigated at least once in every 12 months.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is a committee amendment to this section. The only amendment adopted in the committee was the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. I ask that the Clerk read that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 19, line 17, after "veteran", insert "and also excepting heads of families 45 years of age or older with either a dependent spouse or one or more dependent parents or minor children."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. O'DAY: On page 20, after line 20, insert "No blind person receiving Federal social-security aid shall be prohibited from temporarily relinquishing such aid to accept employment on a Work Projects Administration project."

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Chairman, in almost every State of the Union there are a few W. P. A. projects on which blind people can be successfully employed. One of them is a project sponsored by the Congressional Library here, and it is operated in New York City. It employs 30 blind persons, who are employed in some portion of the building of the talking machines which are distributed throughout the country and are used by their fellow sufferers, and friends. That project has furnished 20,000 talking machines that are sent throughout the United States.

There are other projects in which the blind are employed. For instance, they are employed as proofreaders in the transcribing of books printed in the Braille system. They are used as home teachers to the adult blind who have newly become blind. They are employed as piano tuners in all the public-school systems, and they are used as servants in city and State hospitals.

Under recent regulations those who are eligible for the receipt of Federal Social Security aid are being removed from the W. P. A., and this has caused the enforced idleness of between 300 and 400 blind persons who have been earning their pay for well-done work. We are asking that they be allowed to be kept on the W. P. A. and continue earning

their bread instead of receiving it simply as a kind of dole. I ask for the adoption of this amendment in behalf of the sorely handicapped blind.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. O'DAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am a little uncertain as to the exact purport of the amendment. As I understand it, the gentlewoman desires to preserve the social-security status of those who go on W. P. A. May I ask if the amendment involves drawing both W. P. A. wages and social-security payments simultaneously?

Mrs. O'DAY. I do not think so, no.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They will not draw both at the same time?

Mrs. O'DAY. No.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take just a minute to raise my voice in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York. This amendment does not mean that blind persons can obtain both the social-security payments and compensation when assigned to a project. It gives them the privilege of suspending their social-security payments, as I understand the amendment, if they desire to continue their assignment on a W. P. A. project.

These are unfortunate people who have been visited by blindness. They have the same respect for themselves that we have. They are laboring under the difficulties that the condition of blindness brings about. The W. P. A. assignment of the blind to projects has been a great contribution, particularly the Braille projects.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I take it for granted that under the amendment workers would be eligible to employment in the order of their relative need?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. That is my understanding.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would not interfere with the established routine in that respect?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, according to my understanding.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under those circumstances I see no particular objection to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York. The committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am pleased to note the fine position taken by my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], which means that the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot arrive at some agreement about the time to be spent on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair give the gentleman from Missouri some information? When we began the session at noon there were 15 amendments on the Clerk's desk to consider. There are now 16 amendments to be offered to this one section.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am certain that no one desires to use a great deal of time on these amendments. We ought to be able to decide each of them with a comparatively few minutes of debate.

Mr. TABER. May I make a suggestion?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Why not let everyone who speaks limit himself to 2 minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I believe that would be a very good agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 2 minutes to each speaker.

Mr. HOOK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, would that mean 2 minutes on each amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Two minutes to each speaker.

Mr. HOOK. I have two amendments. I would not have any objection if I had 2 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Two minutes to each amendment, of course, the total time not to exceed 32 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to congratulate the members of the committee who on two occasions, this year and last year, approved the humanitarian amendment that has been passed by the House this afternoon. This, my amendment, is set forth in the bill on page 19, line 17, where there is an exemption for heads of families 45 years of age or over, with either a dependent spouse, or one or more dependent parents or minor children.

My purpose in talking about this amendment at this time is to make known the intention of the committee that the phrase "heads of families" means persons, and may be either the father, the mother, the son or the daughter. Therefore, this intention of the Congress should be so interpreted by those administering the law.

I do not wish to take much time, but the solicitude of the Congress along this line has caused industry to take special recognition of men who are heads of families 45 years of age or older. In a two-page spread in the Saturday Evening Post there was an advertisement depicting a man of middle age on a park bench staring at the smokestacks of industry in the distance. A worried brow, and the clutch of the want-ad section of the daily paper, gives evidence of his condition as a victim of his forty-fifth birthday. Then the corporation proceeds to make its point with the statement: "Our employees of 45 and over have been retained in our industry."

A week ago one of the national oil companies, on a coast-to-coast broadcast, referred to their policy of keeping employed their older men who are heads of families. The very fact that industry makes this boast is proof that there has been an abuse in the past. And you Members of Congress by your action in this House last year in passing this amendment, and this year in enacting it again, are bringing to the forefront the fact that there is general recognition of the abuse that has taken place that should be corrected. [Applause.]

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BELL: On page 19, line 17, after the word "veterans", insert "unmarried widows of the dependents of such veterans."

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to rectify what I think is, perhaps, an oversight or an error; in any event, it certainly will cure a grave injustice and an inconsistency. In this paragraph we provide that everyone on W. P. A. who has been there for 18 months shall be stricken from the rolls with one or two exceptions. One of those exceptions is veterans and we provide that veterans shall be exempted from the provisions of this section. We do not provide in the section, as it has been drawn, that the widows of veterans with their children shall also be exempted.

Now, manifestly, it is a ridiculous thing to say that a young man, able-bodied and without dependents, should receive more consideration when it comes to leaving them on these rolls than the widow of a man, when that widow has dependents. I think there is not a veteran in the United States who would not like to have the knowledge that his widow and his children will be taken care of even in preference to himself. Now, someone may say that this is already taken care of because the section exempts heads of families above 45 years.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the Chairman of the Committee would not be willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is our expectation to accept the amendment. Its omission was an inadvertence.

Mr. BELL. I am sure of that, and I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 20, line 21, after the word "alien", insert a comma and the following: "no Communist and no member of any Nazi bund organization."

And on page 21, line 2, after the word "citizenship", insert "and to the effect that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi bund organization."

And on page 21, line 3, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi bund organization."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I may state to the gentleman that we will be pleased to accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEALEY: Page 19, line 15, strike out the entire paragraph lettered (b) from line 15 through the period and line 25.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to strike out the 18 months' restriction entirely. The House has already adopted the amendment of the committee making the 18 months' provision not applicable to heads of families 45 years of age or over. My amendment will strike out the restriction entirely. As I understand it, the basic reason for the inclusion of this restrictive amendment originally was to discourage persons seeking a career on W. P. A. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, if you will read the hearings relating to this particular matter, from page 435 to page 441, you will discover that this harsh and cruel provision has failed dismally to accomplish this purpose. As a matter of fact, it has meant untold hardship to many workers and their families, workers whose need for this employment was beyond question, and if this provision is retained it will continue to work great hardship on millions of W. P. A. workers. Since its adoption over 1,089,000 workers were dropped from W. P. A. jobs.

Three weeks after the first group was dropped, W. P. A. conducted a survey to discover what the results had been because of the laying off of these people under this clause. Only 7.6 percent of those persons who were dropped had obtained employment in private enterprise. One-half of those who had been dropped reported no income at all for the 3 weeks since their lay-off, and many of those were heads of families, and their children suffered as a result of this harsh and cruel provision.

Subsequent surveys conducted to ascertain the effect of this provision on dismissed workers revealed that only about 13 percent had jobs in private industry. In other words, little more than the normal turn-over from the W. P. A. to jobs in private industry has been achieved by this restriction. I reiterate it has not accomplished its purpose, it has only resulted in hardship and distress for the dropped workers and their families. I hope the Committee will see fit to strike it out entirely.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the most unfair amendment yet offered to the bill. If you adopt this amendment, you endow every person on the rolls for life. When we investigated tenure on the rolls with a view to drafting this provision, we found men who had gone on when W. P. A. was first organized and had been there ever since. In some cities such cases accounted for 40 percent of the entire assignment. These early birds got on the rolls and stayed there, and nobody else could get on. All over the country there are others just as needy, just as deserving, and just as much entitled to consideration as these favored few,

and this section gives them all an equal chance. It provides for rotation. It passes the pie around. It permits equal distribution. If you should adopt this amendment, you would freeze every man on the job, and he could stay there as long as he lived. I am certain you will agree with me the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEALEY) there were—ayes 23, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Page 19, lines 3, 4, and 5, after the word "be", in line 3, strike out "determined, as far as practicable, on the basis of relative needs, and shall, where the relative needs are found to be the same, be given" and insert in lieu thereof the following wording: "given in each region to those who are qualified and available."

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to give a definite veterans' preference. The present wording of the act is:

Determination is, as far as practicable, on the basis of relative needs, and shall, where the relative needs are found to be the same—

Those two clauses, "determination as far as practicable" and "on the basis of relative needs," defeat the actual purpose of the veterans' preference, and my amendment provides that this preference shall be given to the veterans in each region "to those who are qualified and available." Under the wording of the act it would still be necessary for the veteran to be in need, to be qualified, and available. It makes a definite veterans' preference.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If this amendment is adopted, the Administrator of W. P. A. must give the veteran preference, and there is no if or about it.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; if he is in need, and is qualified and available.

Under the present system the clear desire to grant veterans preference is oftentimes defeated. Veterans in need, qualified, and properly certified are still awaiting assignment. This amendment will clarify the situation and give preference, but not an undue advantage, because the veteran would have to be in need, properly investigated, and certified. I urge the adoption of this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am sympathetic, and I suggested a minute ago that the Chairman consent to an amendment that would help veterans, but I do not think that the veterans ought to come here and ask that they be given a preference where their need is not as great as that of other people. I think that the relative need proposition is one of the finest things that could be written into the bill. I do not think anyone ought to take any other position.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PETERSON of Florida) there were—ayes 36 and noes 50.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SECCOMBE: Page 19, line 23, after "(a)", strike the remainder of line 23 and that part of line 24, including "(b)."

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest hardships inflicted on the work-relief bill of last year was the insertion of the 30 days' forced lay-off after continuous 18 months' work.

I recently had a W. P. A. investigation in my congressional district. The State administrator admitted that in no case was there ever a man or a woman who, after they had

worked 18 months, was placed back on W. P. A. in less than 60 to 90 days.

There is never a project anywhere of W. P. A. but what the project is finished, and they have to take more than 30 days off awaiting reassignment. Gentlemen, that 30 days was one of the greatest hardships we placed in that bill. It was placed there so that you could place someone else on who was waiting, but that has not been the case. Projects that have been submitted have always been finished, and they have had to take more than 30 days off. Gentlemen, they do not make a living on W. P. A., notwithstanding they have to take 30 days. Give these people a living wage and do not add more misery to them. I plead with you to strike out this 30-day provision. Why make them wait 30 days and place these people a year or two back in financial distress, where they were before they were assigned? I say to you from the experience of the past year on W. P. A., we should take that as the yardstick for today to place provisions in this bill so that it will be more workable and not work greater hardship on these people. This 30 days certainly should be stricken out. I challenge you to show me where there has been any real relative need, after they were off 30 days, where they were reassigned—yes, 40 days or 50 days.

I ask you to support this amendment. Give these people a chance and a right to work where they are assigned to a project.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if we leave out this section, we might as well leave out the whole paragraph.

What opportunity is there for rotation if you put them back as soon as taken off? And if you do not propose to put them back as soon as taken off, what necessity is there for the amendment?

As a matter of fact, the dismissals have now leveled out to the extent that they affect only approximately 3 percent anyway. The situation does not justify modifications in any of the provisions of the section. May I ask for a vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECCOMBE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SECCOMBE) there were—ayes 37 and noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IZAC: Page 19, line 11, after the word "who" strike out "are in need" and insert "have been certified as in need of employment by the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it so to certify."

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, the reason for this amendment is simply that there is no uniformity in the country at the present time in the determination of need. In some States the certifying agency is the State relief administration, and the Work Projects Administration has to take their findings. This amendment of mine merely makes it possible for either the Work Projects Administration or the certifying agency that they have already picked out, may make the certification, as to the need of employment, for it specifically states "certification by either the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it so to certify."

I certainly trust that the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on page 20, section (d), we make provision for just this situation. The gentleman's amendment is already in the bill. To adopt such a proposal here would be duplication. I ask for a vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAHERTY: Page 19, line 17, after the word "veterans", strike out the word "veterans" and insert "war, campaign, and expedition veterans, the wives of such veterans as are unemployed, and unmarried widows of such veterans."

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAHERTY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is not that the same amendment that was adopted?

Mr. FLAHERTY. No. I might state, Mr. Chairman, that we adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri providing that the widows of veterans shall be exempt from the provisions of this section of the bill. I go a step further in my amendment and designate that these veterans shall be veterans of a war, campaign, or expedition. I believe that under the present wording of the section peace-time veterans could be included in the exemptions.

A further exception is asked in the case of wives of unemployed veterans; whereas the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri merely specified widows of veterans should be excepted, I go a little further in my amendment by saying that the wives of unemployed veterans shall be included in these exemptions. My reason for including that group is that we are all aware that such people do not constitute the career group we found on W. P. A. We are also aware that just as soon as they are furloughed from W. P. A. they are automatically restored to the relief rolls, and at the expiration of 30 days, by a previous provision of this bill, they are automatically entitled to reinstatement on W. P. A. program. So I think it is really a waste of administrative action.

I hope the committee will accept this amendment as one that will induce efficiency in administration as well as provide relief for a class of people who deserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLAHERTY) there were—ayes 54, noes 49.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers. Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on three subjects, the 30-day lay-off, the Casey amendment, and the 25-percent contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for the enactment of the Work Relief Appropriation Act of 1940 with grave misgivings and with a firm conviction that the bill, as it comes to the final vote on passage, contains many objectionable features, features which I feel will work a hardship on the unemployed people we are seeking to aid through this appropriation.

I have, however, voted on every possible occasion during the consideration of the bill, and during consideration of proposed amendments to the bill, to eliminate the features which I feel are objectionable.

I am now faced with the question of voting for the best that we can now hope to obtain from the present Congress or voting against any appropriations for work relief for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1940.

My decision, naturally, is to vote for this bill, as I certainly do not wish to be in the position of having voted against all relief.

I opposed and voted against the 30-day-furlough plan in the bill, giving my support to the Voorhis amendment which would have eliminated the clause of the pending act that will again require W. P. A. officials to remove from the rolls all persons, excepting veterans and heads of families over 45 years of age, who have been on the rolls 18 months or more.

I opposed this same feature of the work-relief appropriation bill last year, feeling that the furlough clause would not achieve the avowed purpose of putting people who have been on W. P. A. back into private employment and feeling that it would result in considerable hardship and suffering.

The present bill does protect veterans and heads of families over 45 years of age, and that I favor. However, there is a vast number of younger men and women who are heads of families whose need of this work is serious, and to these this bill says, in effect, "Go get another job or go hungry and let

your family do likewise." If the other job was available there would be some reason in this provision of the bill, but what assurances can we give these unprotected heads of families that they can find another job? I am afraid that there will be little hope in too many cases.

Experience has convinced me that my opposition to the furlough clause a year ago was right and proper, and I have stood by that decision in my consideration of this year's bill.

I have also supported an amendment which would have increased this year's work-relief appropriation from \$975,-650,000 to \$2,232,000,000. This was the Casey amendment. In supporting this amendment I did so because I did not feel that the original bill provided sufficient funds to offer jobs to nearly all of those in need and who want to work.

In this action I considered that I could not insist on providing jobs without having the fortitude to vote for sufficient funds to provide the pay for the workers.

I have also supported an amendment to the bill which would have eliminated the requirement that project sponsors provide not less than 25 percent of the total cost of all projects. Such a provision will only serve to eliminate many worth-while projects on which many much-needed jobs would otherwise be provided.

I did, however, vote for a requirement that would have caused project sponsors to provide 10 percent of the total cost of each project, feeling that local units of Government must cooperate in a financial way to the limit of their ability.

In my consideration of this bill and all of its features and all of the proposed amendments I have stood by my established practice of voting for what I feel is very necessary for the aid of those who are unable to find employment in private work.

While we hope that private employment will soon eliminate the need for a Federal made-work program, none of us know when that goal may be reached. Because of the uncertainty, I have felt it mandatory upon me to do all that I could to eliminate suffering until such time as private jobs are available.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 19, line 1, strike out all of section 15 and substitute the following:

"Sec. 15 (a) Persons capable of and willing to work, who are unemployed, and who are registered with the United States Employment Service shall be eligible for employment on Work Projects Administration work projects and no certification that the applicant for employment is in need of or in receipt of relief shall be required.

"(b) Preference in employment and retention in employment shall be on the basis of the relative need for employment and shall be given first to persons without any source of personal income, and, second, to persons whose monthly income is less than the monthly earning provided under this act.

"(c) Where relative need for employment is found to be the same, preference in employment and retention in employment shall be given in the following order: (1) Veterans who have had active service in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard during any war or in any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration), unmarried widows of such veterans, and wives of such veterans, who are in need of employment and are American citizens; (2) other American citizens, Indians, and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need of employment; and (3) aliens who have obtained their first citizenship papers and have made reasonable effort to secure citizenship and been unable to do so through no fault of their own and who are in need of employment: *Provided, however*, That no alien shall be employed if there are in the same locality citizens who have been found to be in need of employment but who have not been employed by the Work Projects Administration.

"(d) No worker employed by the Work Projects Administration shall be dismissed, except for cause, unless there is available to him private employment at reasonable wages and working conditions.

"(e) In considering employment of persons upon work projects prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution, the agency providing the employment shall determine whether such persons are able to perform the work on work projects to which they can be assigned, and no person shall be employed or retained for employment on any such project whose work habits are such or work record shows that he is incapable of performing satisfactorily the work to which he may be assigned on the project.

"(f) The Work Projects Administration shall publish quarterly statistics of the number and distribution of eligible applications on file for employment and shall report to Congress immediately any significant changes in the number and distribution of such applications."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have only 2 minutes to explain an amendment of great importance. Briefly, my amendment would make this a work program rather than a relief program. It would make it possible for a man to work without having first to go on the relief rolls. It provides that the man who has fought hard and managed to stay off of relief but who has no income will have a chance to get work on the W. P. A. At present he is not so eligible. It would mean that a disabled veteran who is now getting \$20 or \$30 a month compensation could still have an opportunity to get a W. P. A. job. At present he is barred in most cases. This amendment provides in the next place that there would be no 18 months lay-off provision, and that people would be laid off for cause or where private jobs were actually available. The truth is that 2 months after the lay-offs of last fall, when some 770,000 people were laid off under the 18-month rule, barely 100,000 of those people had gotten private jobs. On the other hand there are, each month, about 100,000 people who leave W. P. A. of their own volition because they have gotten jobs in private industry. That is the kind of rotation that is going on all the time and it is, I believe, the right kind. The 18-month rule on the other hand has fallen in many cases upon the very people who could not for one reason or another hope to get jobs in private industry.

In the next place this amendment would require the keeping of current records by W. P. A. as to the number of applicants for employment, people unemployed without income, registered with the United States Employment Service and in need of employment; and regular reports to Congress would be made in order that Congress might take these facts into account in determining what it should do about this program.

In a word, then, if this amendment were adopted, what you would have would be a work program with no stigma of relief attached to it for those people out of work so certified to be out of work who have no income to depend upon to keep their families.

One more thing, my amendment puts the bar against aliens on a different basis, not the one that you have now which is absolute. It provides that an alien who has taken out his first papers and who has made every effort to obtain citizenship may have a job if there are no citizens in his community available to take the jobs. This, it seems to me, is much more fair and just than an absolute bar applying against aliens who are trying their best to become American citizens.

I believe that if I had time to explain this amendment as thoroughly as I should, the House would be interested in it and would be inclined favorably toward it.

I have included the language of the committee exactly word for word where they have provided in the bill that a person not found to be able to do the work on certain projects shall not be put on those projects. That is another one of the purposes I had in connection with this amendment, for it is consistent with the work-program idea.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Page 20, line 1, strike out all of lines 1 to 10, inclusive.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, we should make no mistake about this matter. This is a relief program, not a works program. Every time this House has expressed itself by a vote we have designated that this is a relief measure. Now, I am opposed to section (c) because I feel it is abused. This section deals with ability to work and not willingness to work. Under this section, no one can get work unless the Director says they are able to do the work. The result is a

smart young chap who can catch on to things stays on the job, while some poor, unfortunate individual who may be slightly handicapped or disabled or one who may be worried to such an extent he is just a bit inefficient, cannot get on. This able-bodied, smart fellow can get work much easier in private enterprise. When it comes right down to it, this is a relief program and you are denying its benefits to the most worthy of all the categories named; that is, the people who are slightly disabled or have some handicap and are not quite up to the average.

There is sometimes a temptation for the relief director to employ the capable fellow to foster his program, make a good showing in the community and with the Administration, and to discharge the slightly disabled. I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman realize the paragraph is of some protection to the Government in getting rid of chiselers and shovel-leaners who will not work? The only way you can get at them is under this paragraph. We should be for the honest worker, not for the chiseler. Give them a chance to get rid of the chiseler.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is being abused. I am not defending the lazy. I do defend the slightly disabled. This section that I propose to strike out does not deal with their willingness to work.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a work bill and not a bill to encourage loafing. This section protects the W. P. A. from the most frequently voiced criticism of the relief program. How often we hear the familiar objection that it provides sinecures for fellows who will not work. Under this provision men who do not work cannot stay on W. P. A. It is the one guaranty that the W. P. A. will get some service in return for its money. Under the gentleman's amendment a man can lean on his shovel all day long and you cannot fire him.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hook: Page 19, line 4, after the word "needs" and before the word "and", insert "Provided, however, That the fact a person has an insurance or benefit policy which he or she has carried 12 years or more or which has a cash loan value of \$500 or less shall not be considered in determining the actual need of such employment."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather simple amendment. The type of people that this amendment will help reside in each of your congressional districts. An old couple, who have throughout their lives been members of some fraternal society, insurance benefit group, or who have carried an insurance policy for the purpose of having something so that they may not be buried in potter's field, will be taken care of by my amendment. They have paid month after month on such insurance policy so that they will have money enough to bury them when they die. Now, the W. P. A. says to them, "You must go out and eat up the loan value of that policy and go to a potter's grave when you die."

I hope my amendment will be adopted so that at least those old people may be able to be buried in a cemetery, so that they may be given a decent burial and not be sent to the potter's field.

My amendment will exempt these policies up to \$500 loan value. Of course the social-welfare commission of the State of Michigan or any other State certifying agency has the right and could exempt these policies, and some State agencies have seen fit to do so. Most of the States have not. Michigan is one of the States that have refused to do this. Therefore I want to see this written into the law and made manda-

tory. If the social welfare commission of Michigan under the present State administration is willing to let these old people go to a potter's grave I am not. Let us at least give these old people peace of mind enough that they may at least have the assurance of a decent burial.

Pass this amendment and ease your own conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hook) there were—ayes 49, noes 59.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hook: Page 19, line 13, add after the words "and are American citizens" the following words: "Provided, That the fact that a person is entitled to, or has received, either adjusted-service bonds, or a treasury check, in payment of an adjusted-compensation certificate, or has an insurance policy with the United States Government, shall not be considered in determining actual need of such employment."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, in explaining this amendment I want to read a letter I received this morning from a veteran. He states:

DEAR SIR: Being an ex-soldier, I was laid off the W. P. A. because I have \$300 of my soldier's bonus left, and have to spend it before I can be reinstated.

When we passed the legislation providing for the soldiers' bonus, and when we gave the soldiers their bonds, we did not expect that we were going to say to them, "We are giving this to you temporarily, and you must eat it up; then after you eat it up you can get a job on the W. P. A., and not until then." My amendment allows the veteran to keep his adjusted-service certificate and his bonds, without being forced to sell them before he is entitled to a job on the W. P. A. We should not force them to sell their bonds. That was not the intent of Congress. We expected them to keep those bonds as an insurance.

This amendment was a part of the relief bill that passed in 1938. I was the author of the amendment. I hope that it will be included again. It was inadvertently left out of the last relief bill. Part of the ex-service men are entitled to relief and part are not as it stands now. If they cashed in on their bonds they are eligible for relief, but not otherwise, because up until a year ago they were exempted from the provisions of the bill and they were certified even though they had their soldiers' bonus. I hope you will at least allow the men to whom we voted the bonus to have the benefit of those certificates so that they may be able to enjoy some of the benefits we so gratuitously gave them at that time. I hope you will stand by these ex-service men and extend them a helping hand.

I am fully aware that the social-welfare commission in my State has the right to provide that these bonds and certificates shall not be taken into consideration in determining the need of a veteran, but they do not see fit to do so when they investigate them for certification and, therefore, I would like to see this written into the law. This amendment should pass.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rankin: On page 19, line 12, after the word "citizens", insert "and if the income of any such person from any Government agency is less than the amount to which he or she would be entitled for work on a W. P. A. project, for which he or she is qualified, then he or she shall be certified for employment and shall be assigned to work for at least a sufficient number of hours each month to bring his or her total income up to the amount he or she would receive if assigned for full-time work on such project."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is merely to enable those veterans who are drawing small compensation and who are now being denied work on W. P. A. to have work for a sufficient number of hours each month to bring their pay up to what it would be if they were not veterans or not drawing compensation. It merely gives them the right to have these extra hours of work to bring them up to what they would make if they were drawing no compensation at all.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The veterans who would benefit under the gentleman's amendment are all men who have service-connected disabilities?

Mr. RANKIN. Well, they are at least disabled.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. At the point the gentleman has inserted his amendment, after "American citizens," it would not apply to veterans at all.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. TABER. No; it would apply to everybody else but veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. No; this applies to veterans. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri if I am not right about that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Where does the gentleman propose to insert his amendment in line 12?

Mr. TABER. After "American citizens" in line 12. It applies to everybody but veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. TABER. The veterans are provided for above.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman understands that if his amendment is inserted before the first semicolon it means one thing, and if inserted between the words "citizens" and "Indians" it means another thing. Just where was the gentleman's amendment offered?

Mr. RANKIN. What I intended to do, was cover the veterans and their dependents.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am inclined to believe the gentleman intended to insert his amendment at another point.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified so that it may be inserted before the semicolon in line 12.

I hope the gentleman from Missouri will agree to this amendment. I believe it is a very meritorious amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported as modified?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment with the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 19, line 12, before the semicolon, insert: "and if the income of any such person from any Government agency is less than the amount to which he or she would be entitled for work on a W. P. A. project, for which he or she is qualified, then he or she shall be certified for employment, and shall be assigned to work for at least a sufficient number of hours each month to bring his or her total income up to the amount he or she would receive if assigned for full-time work on such project."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 19, line 6, strike out lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 up to the comma and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) Veterans who have had active service in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or in some campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this is one of three amendments I am offering for the purpose of clarifying the section which has to do with veterans.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri. Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does this amendment as read comprise the gentleman's entire proposition?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This is one of three amendments I am offering for the purpose of clarifying the entire veterans' section.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As I understand the gentleman's proposal it merely harmonizes the amendments which have previously been agreed to. It makes no change in the section as modified, but merely clarifies and articulates the amendments already adopted.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes; that is correct. The amendment I offer is merely a clarifying amendment since section 15 (a), paragraph (1), line 8, reads both the veteran and his wife may demand preference, whereas if my amendment is adopted the preference will be confined to the wife where the veteran is unemployable.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On that statement I believe the committee would be disposed to accept the amendment, inasmuch as its only purpose is to iron out conflicting verbiage of amendments previously agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 19, line 11, after the word "veterans", add the following: "as are unemployable."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 19, line 14, after the word "need" strike out all of paragraph (b) and insert a new paragraph (b) to read as follows:

"(b) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers, excepting veterans, unmarried widows of such veterans, and wives of such veterans who are unemployable, and also excepting heads of families 45 years of age or older with either a dependent spouse or one or more dependent parents or minor children, who have been continuously employed on such project for more than 18 months, and any relief worker so removed shall be ineligible to be restored to employment on such projects until after (a) the expiration of 30 days after the date of his removal and (b) recertification of his eligibility for restoration to employment on such projects."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment. It merely clarifies amendments previously adopted.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL to the amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Strike out the word "forty-five" appearing in the amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT and insert the word "forty."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I much regret that we cannot accept the amendment. This is already too generous a provision, and the danger is that even with this low age limit we will reach a static situation monopolized by people of 45 years of age or more. If any change is made, the age limit should be raised rather than lowered. I hope the House will vote down the amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in support of the amendment to reduce the 45-year employable exception to 40 years.

I think the temper of the House is such that there is not very much question in my mind but what the committee will accept the amendment. Certainly, fathers 40 years of age are entitled to as much consideration, and in more instances have the responsibility of minors on their hands, who must be supported, than men of 45, and I cannot see any reason in the world why this amendment should not prevail.

I do not believe the expense to the Government will amount to very much more, if any more. These people are being put to considerable hardship because they are eliminated from W. P. A. rolls, and then after the specified period or waiting time cannot get back on the rolls. The children in these households are exposed to hunger, hardship, and difficulty. I think that the 40-year provision is reasonable; in fact, I do not believe there ever should have been any such condition or exclusion in the law, and now, certainly, the 40-year provision should be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 15?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Page 20, strike out the word "relief" in lines 12 and 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendment to section 15, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 16. (a) No person in need who refuses a bona fide offer of private or other public employment under reasonable working conditions which pays the prevailing wage for such work in the community where he resides and who is capable of performing such work shall be employed or retained in employment on work projects under the funds appropriated in this joint resolution for the period such private or other public employment would be available.

(b) Any person who takes such employment shall at the expiration thereof be entitled to immediate resumption of his previous employment status with the Work Projects Administration if he is still in need and if he has lost such employment through no fault of his own, and if he has first drawn all the benefits of unemployment compensation that shall have accrued to him during his term in private employment and which are available to him.

Sec. 17. (a) No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless such person has previously subscribed or before engaging in such employment subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

(b) No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

(c) The Commissioner and the head of any other agency receiving an appropriation hereunder is authorized to designate employees, administrative and supervisory, as he may deem necessary to administer such oaths as are required by this joint resolution and such other oaths as may be required or necessary in the operation of the Work Projects Administration or other agency, which oaths shall be administered without charge or fee; such oaths shall have the same force and effect as oaths administered by notaries, justices of the peace, and other Federal and non-Federal officers qualified to administer oaths.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. RICH: Page 22, line 18, strike out the words "through force or violence."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on all amendments to the pending bill the

time for debate on each amendment be restricted to 2 minutes on a side.

Mr. RICH. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Chairman, I confine my request to the pending section.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Does this mean that this is the only amendment to this section, and the gentleman is going to limit me to 2 minutes?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; 2 minutes on a side to each amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. If we are going to finish this bill tonight, we have to do something of that kind; we must limit ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that on all amendments to this section and all amendments thereto, debate be limited on each amendment to 2 minutes on a side. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this reads:

(b) No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

I want to cut out the words "through force or violence", because anyone who advocates the overthrow of this Government should not be paid compensation by this Government under any circumstances. We heard, last Friday, the speech delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES] about the people who are trying to build up a "fifth column," who are trying to overthrow our Government. I think we ought to clamp down on those people before they overthrow us, and we should do everything we can to maintain our form and system of government. We should not in any way be helping people who try to overthrow the Government, by putting them on relief. If we wait until they come in with force and violence before we do that, it might be too late. I hope the Members of the House will agree to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. For the past several years we have been confronted with a problem in the work projects organization which has caused the Oklahoma delegation some concern and which has come to a head recently, and bitter complaints have resounded through the State on account of the employment of women on lucrative nonrelief administration jobs whose husbands hold good jobs in other capacities. Of course, the complaint becomes vocal against a relief organization which employs people not in need of relief, on account of other members of their families making good salaries.

Each member of the delegation has received through the mail in the last few days a list of names of the ladies employed in administrative jobs, together with information as to the employment of their husbands. It is apparent that the husbands have sufficiently profitable positions, and no explanation can be had of such employment except on the grounds of efficiency of the women employees. The Work Projects Administration organization answers that for the sake of the efficiency of the Department these women have been employed. The complainants answer that there are hundreds, even thousands, of women who do not have husbands to support them who could do the administration of nonrelief work equally as well as those who have husbands with jobs.

After a full discussion of the subject with Col. Lawrence Westbrook, regional director of Work Projects Administration in the Oklahoma region, in which the members of the Oklahoma delegation took part, it was agreed that a survey would be made to determine the number of married women employed by the Administration in Oklahoma, whose husbands are employed or otherwise able to support them, and that hereafter, effective as of June 1, the number of women

with husbands able to support them would be limited in Oklahoma to 5 percent employed in an administrative capacity, according to the tenor of a telegram received from Ron Stephens, Oklahoma administrator, which reads as follows:

Advise that survey in process to determine number of married women employed in this administration whose husbands are employed or otherwise able to support them. Also number of married men whose wives are employed with sufficient salaries or otherwise have sufficient income to support family. In any event such cases will be limited to a figure not to exceed 5 percent employed in administrative capacity effective as of June 1. No person will be employed or continued in employment who does not need the job for the support of his or her family except in instances requiring extraordinary competence and technical qualifications consistent with the requirements of the operation of a constructive work program.

The Oklahoma delegation has been confronted with another problem, namely, employment of supervisory employees coming from outside the congressional districts. This issue was also settled, according to the terms of the following telegram from Ron Stephens, administrator.

Advise that complete survey being made to determine the number of administrative and supervisory employees in the State including the foremen and timekeepers, etc., who are now residents of the W. P. A. district in which they are employed. Instructions have been issued that such instances shall not exceed 5 percent total number employed. This rule of course cannot be made applicable to those persons who are employed on State-wide projects. Instructions to this effect have been issued effective as of June 1.

Mr. Chairman, my object in rising at this time is to make official record of these negotiations and agreements.

The 5-percent leeway will probably be found useful in the event it is absolutely necessary to retain a few of the people who cannot be replaced except at a loss in the efficiency of the Administration.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pro forma amendment. I am in thorough sympathy with the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] which has just been agreed to apropos of Communists. I would like to consign all Communists to a cesspool so deep that if they tried to look up they would not even see hell. Nevertheless, as a lawyer and a member of the responsible committee of this House, I cannot remain silent in the face of the amendment just adopted. It will never stand the test of any court, because anybody who advocates any amendment to our Constitution, or any series of amendments to our Constitution, advocates a change in our form of government. The courts would throw the amendment back to your teeth. You are doing something utterly idle and futile. The amendment is unconstitutional. I say this despite the fact that I loathe these Fascists and Communists and Nazis, but I think you gentlemen who are Members of this honorable body ought to give some real thought to this proposition and not be guided by merely your emotions.

You should not let your emotions get the best of you.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman forgets this says "overthrow the Government," not modify it.

Mr. CELLER. Even so that would not affect the situation one iota as far as the courts are concerned. Remember the Communist Party is recognized as legal in many States, including my own State of New York. Their candidates' names appear on the ballots of many States. Preferably I would have the amendment proscribe all persons who owe allegiance to any foreign government, prince, or potentate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 18. In carrying out the purpose of the appropriations in this joint resolution, the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of special funds for any agency receiving an appropriation under this joint resolution, in the nature of revolving funds for use until June 30, 1941, in the purchase, repair, distribution, or rental of materials, supplies, equipment, and tools.

SEC. 19. The provision of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase made or service procured

in connection with the appropriations in this joint resolution when the aggregate amount involved is less than \$300.

SEC. 20. The appropriations in this joint resolution for administrative expenses and such portions of other appropriations in this joint resolution as are available for administrative expenses may be obligated in the amounts which the agency, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall have certified to the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary for personal services, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for contract stenographic reporting services, supplies, and equipment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings of officials and employees of the agency on official business; rental at the seat of government and elsewhere; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding and such other expenses as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the objectives of this joint resolution.

SEC. 21. (a) The provisions of Executive Order No. 7916, dated June 24, 1938, shall not apply to positions the compensation of which is payable from appropriations contained in this joint resolution, and such appropriations shall not be available for the compensation of the incumbent of any position placed in the competitive classified civil service of the United States after January 10, 1939.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution the agencies receiving appropriations herein or allocations under such appropriations are authorized to accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, appoint, without regard to civil-service laws, such officers and employees, and utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed, such Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State such State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the head of the agency involved, as may be necessary, and prescribe their authorities, duties, responsibilities, and tenure, and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of any officers and employees so appointed.

(c) Appointments to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriations in this joint resolution in any State shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this section may be confined to 2 minutes on a side on each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IZAC: Page 25, line 8, strike out all of subsection (c) and insert: "Appointments to, and retention in, Federal positions of administrative, executive, clerical, supervisory, or advisory capacity, under the appropriations in this joint resolution in any State shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration: *Provided*, That preference of appointment to and retention in any such position shall be given to qualified persons in the order specified in section 15 (a) hereof, but without regard to their needs."

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the subcommittee, would pay especial attention to this amendment.

I would like to make it clear that this amendment changes in two features the bill as you have it at the present time, (c) of section 21.

The first change is in that it applies to positions not only of an administrative character but of a supervisory character, which means foremen. Of course, that is very important because most of the jobs in the nonneedy class are in the foreman group, and I would like to have this apply to the foremen jobs; in other words, the supervisory positions. It gives the same kind of exemption from separation as is enjoyed at the present time by Colonel Harrington and his group in the District of Columbia. It applies the same kind of exemption to the people in all the States of the Union as is enjoyed here at the present time.

Then the second feature of this amendment is the proviso which states that the appointment to and retention in these positions shall be in a similar order as in section 15 (a). In 15 (a), as you know, it applies to the needy, those in need; the certified cases. This applies to the administrative staff. I cannot see any reason why the veterans should not have exactly the same kind of advantage, if there is any advantage, in retention and appointment in the noncertified class as in the certified class.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as much in sympathy as we may be with the objective sought to be attained by the gentleman in his amendment, it is a subject that has not been submitted to the committee. No hearings have been held, there is no Budget recommendation. The committee has had no opportunity to go into the question to determine the effect of such an amendment. On that account I regret it would be impossible to agree to the amendment to the amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Izac].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Izac) there were ayes 33 and noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLIOTT: Page 25, line 12, before the period, add a semicolon and the following: "the sponsor of said project may select from the relief rolls the foreman to act under the construction supervisor of the project for which selected."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It just makes it possible for the sponsor or sponsors of a project to have the right to select foremen to operate under the construction engineer or supervisor. In that, it brings coordination between the sponsor and W. P. A. workers. I think it will help a great deal in saving on material, whereby the sponsors will feel they have a relationship with the program after they put up a part of the money.

I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as much as may be said for the amendment, unquestionably the most objectionable feature among many is the fact that it would turn the project over to the exigencies of local politics. That is the feature which has been the occasion of more protests against W. P. A. than any other phase of the entire program, and is just the complication we are trying to avoid. If no other objection could be found the political possibilities suggested by the amendment would be sufficient reason for its rejection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELLIOTT) there were—ayes 28 and noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 22. In making separations from the Federal Service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of this joint resolution, the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however*, That soldiers, sailors, and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

Sec. 23. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits shall apply to persons (except administrative employees qualifying as civil employees of the United States) receiving compensation from the appropriations in this joint resolution for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

Sec. 24. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be used (a) for the operation of any theater project, (b) for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration, or (c) for radio broadcasting or for the acquisition, rental, or distribution of motion-picture films.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, one-half of the time to be controlled by the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is not apparent what the amendment is that is being offered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It will be my intention to yield the time of the committee to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this the amendment reinstating the theater project?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I shall object. We should have more than 10 minutes' debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 26, line 17, after the word "project", insert "unless such theater project be locally sponsored and all persons employed on such theater project are now certified relief workers who have been bona fide members of the theatrical profession on or before July 1, 1933."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reinstate the theater project, but on certain conditions: First, that the project be locally sponsored. Second, that the actors or actresses in the project be certified relief workers. Third, that they shall have been bona fide members of the theatrical profession on or before the date of the first relief bill, namely, July 1, 1933. The latter restriction would keep out mere amateurs and would also remove much cause of opposition on the score that a lot of young men and women, members of many radical organizations, had wormed their way into places of influence and power in the last theater project. My restriction would limit entrance into the project to bona fide members of the profession as of the time of the first relief bill.

As things stand at present we have an anomalous situation with reference to this bill. A mechanic, or carpenter, or bricklayer, an iron worker, a teacher, a musician, or an artist if out of work but ready, willing, and able to work, and in need, can be given a job at the trade or profession best suited to him. You make them all self-respecting. But to an actor or an actress you say, "No."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is there any language in existing law or in this bill which states that an actor or actress who is in need is denied the right of employment on W. P. A.? The gentleman goes too far.

Mr. CELLER. They are denied the right that you give to a musician. They are denied the right which you give to an artist. An artist may continue to paint his pictures, a musician may continue to play his instrument and put forth music under projects sponsored by W. P. A., but to the actor and the actress you say, "You shall not continue your profession; you may become a leaf raker or a 'boondoggler.'" I say that is wrong. To no other group do you offer such a prohibition that you offer the actor. He is the only one banned—specifically banned.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is not the language the gentleman used a minute ago.

Mr. CELLER. I accept the correction that the gentleman has offered.

Why should we place a bar sinister upon the theatrical profession? Why place a heavy penalty upon the drama? The drama is moribund. The radio and the movies have struck death blows against the drama. Most of the theaters in the larger cities, and in New York in particular, are closed. I say we ought to do something for this army of actors and actresses. Actors' Equity, the A. F. of L. theatrical unit, informs me that of their enrollment of 4,200 members only 700 are working now throughout the year. I am further informed by the responsible heads of Actors' Equity that by June only 300 actors and actresses will be employed in the United States. This is a very disgraceful situation if we do not offer a little help to the actors and actresses.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As I understand, the gentleman's amendment simply removes a ban against the conduct

of projects where the actor could carry on his profession in the W. P. A.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. It has been asserted, rightly or wrongly, that in the last theatrical project there was a strain of communism, and Mrs. Halle Flanagan, of Vassar, who headed the project was made a sort of scapegoat. Let us assume that there may have been some Communists in a theatrical project—I do not know whether there were or not—but why visit the sins of the few upon the many? Why bring a general indictment against the entire theatrical profession because there seeped into the Federal Theater Project a few Communists? It seems wrong to treat these actors and actresses in that fashion.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Is it not a fact that actors are the only people who as a group are expressly prohibited from this employment?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. I am glad to have that confirmation of my views from a Member from my own State of New York, for whom I have the highest respect and regard.

They are the only ones proscribed, and it seems wholly unjust that we should do it.

Let us bear in mind the fact that the Federal Theaters Project brought into the Government 2 years ago and prior thereto revenue to the extent of \$3,000,000, and brought happiness, great happiness, to countless thousands of persons who visited the theaters where the drama was produced by these actors and actresses.

I do hope, indeed, therefore, that you will do justice to the theatrical profession.

I said a moment ago that the drama is moribund. We should not strike it now a deathblow. We should remember the great benefits the drama has bestowed upon us all, has bestowed upon English-speaking people for centuries. We owe a vast debt of gratitude to the drama, the drama of Shakespeare, Congreve, Pryor, Ben Jonson, Sheridan. Think of the great and inestimable values that are placed upon the drama of Arnold Bennett, John Galsworthy, James M. Barrie, and those of our own famous American dramatists like Augustus Thomas, Clyde Fitch, Booth Tarkington, Robert Sherwood, Maxwell Anderson, Eugene O'Neill, Sidney Howard. The esthetic value of the drama is inestimable. We would turn the hands of the clock of drama backward if we do not adopt my amendment.

The very actors and actresses whom we hurt have always willingly and unstintingly given of their talents and arts in all worthy causes. For the Red Cross alone in 1937 they raised \$2,000,000. During the past year they raised \$1,000,000 for various relief activities like the President's ball. For the Finnish relief fund drive recently held in New York they raised almost \$100,000. See what they did for the soldiers and sailors in the World War. They dulled the edge of tragedy and despair for our expeditionary forces, and they will do it again if necessary. Is this the way to reward them? Shall this be their recompense?

In conclusion, let me quote from the testimony of Miss Maïda Reade, of the Actors Equity Association, page 1139 of the hearings on the W. P. A. bill. She spoke of the Actors Equity in connection with the Federal Theater Project. I quote part of her testimony:

Equity raised all other expenses, such as royalties, scenery, props, costumes, and transportation. The work was done so efficiently that the appropriation was gradually increased and when the supervision was taken away from Equity there were 600 or 700 actors employed on the project. We practiced the most rigid economy, put on most satisfactory plays, tried out with the board of education plays relevant to subjects in English and history then being studied in the schools. We also had a subproject for dramatic writers, and in coordination with Dr. Fechner, head of the C. C. C. camps, started dramatic productions throughout the camps in the eastern territory.

These actors and actresses do not want a dole or charity. They want work and jobs in connection with their honorable profession.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a member of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the very engaging remarks of my good friend from New York, who is anxious that the Federal Theater Project be rehabilitated on the basis of sponsorship by any local community. It is a most ingenious argument, and, of course, as he advances it here and as everybody understands it, inasmuch as these folk were identified with the theatrical profession it becomes the responsibility and obligation of the Federal Government to continue them in that type of work. It reminds me a good deal of the way they tried to run a prison in this country a few years ago. They endeavored to satisfy everybody who was sent to the prison by giving them the kind of job they had before being sent there. A very ingenious gentleman came up, and the warden said, "What did you do before you were convicted?" He said, "I was a traveling salesman."

If we are going to follow out this logic, we might just as well ask folks whether they were traveling salesmen before they made application for W. P. A., then act accordingly. What about all the poor, indigent lawyers in this country? There are lots of them starving to death. Therefore we should set up a project and say, "Since you are so well schooled in the art of Blackstone, we are going to set up a lawyers' project." What about all these wielders of the scalpel who cut out your appendix and who probe into the undefined depths of the anatomy? Why not say to these doctors and medicos, "We are going to have a project for you"? We may also have a project for the traveling salesmen of the country, and for almost every type of work. There are some 1,800 different fields of endeavor listed by the civil service. Let us have a project for everybody, and all will be grand and glorious.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. What do you do about the musicians? Do you not give them work in a profession that they have carried on for years? You do not make them bricklayers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can the gentleman find anything in section 24 that will give any special dispensation in behalf of musicians? I will say to my good friend there is none here. But the gentleman is trying to set up a special dispensation for those who were actors and actresses, concert artists, and so forth prior to 1933. If you are going to be logical and carry it to a conclusion, then I still insist upon a classification for traveling salesmen.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. We already have a provision for the lawyers in the Walter-Logan bill, as I remember it.

Mr. SACKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SACKS. I call attention to the fact that this amendment does not set up anything for a specific group. It merely takes away a prohibition. There is no prohibition in the bill anywhere against musicians, artists, or anybody else. Therefore, the gentleman's argument that it gives a special privilege to the theatrical people seems to be wrong.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is talking about the section of the bill, and I am talking about the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. As far as the prohibition is concerned, of course, the prohibition was inserted in the bill, as the gentleman so well remembers, when the relief bill was here last year. At that time it was either my misfortune or fortune to have an opportunity to say a few kind and unkind words about the operation of the Federal Theater Project. I knew something about it, because some of these amateur Thespians—shall I say—came and

graced my office and told me about their difficulties, so I know a good deal about it first-hand. I certainly could not lend my efforts to it, and I think it would be a mistake on the part of the Congress to resurrect this endeavor in the field of histrionics all over again by setting up a Federal Theater Project.

Mr. CELLER. The reason why I included in my amendment the limitation that the actor or actress had to be a member of the theatrical profession prior to July 1, 1933, was to avoid bringing these so-called amateur Thespians into the Theater Project and to prevent the so-called Workers Alliance from dominating the situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend who is so devoted to the arts would not want to make that discrimination, because, after all, genius does not recognize any separation of time and it might be just as apparent after 1933 as before.

Mr. CELLER. But you strike it all out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is this not the group that gave us Up in Myrtle's Room?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; this is the group that presented Up in Myrtle's Room, Getting Gertie's Garter, and some of the other farces of America at that time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman does not presume to say that the objections which he raised to the titles of the past year or whenever it was would apply against this amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; not necessarily.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. This is for a new start.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I only make the point based upon the logic advanced by the gentleman from New York, if you are going to have classifications, if you are going to perpetuate people in a line of endeavor that they have pursued heretofore, then let us be logical and let us find jobs for traveling salesmen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about Congressmen who are out of a job?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to section 24. I recognize that time for debate has expired, but I should like to have the amendment voted on.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COFFEE of Washington: On page 26, line 18, after the word "Administration" strike out the remainder of line 18 and all of lines 19 and 20.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, section 24 (c) forbids the use of any of the funds appropriated in the Works Progress Administration bill for the use of radio broadcasting or motion pictures. It seems to me that, when the Nation's security is imperiled and when the value and importance of our natural resources—our supplies of timber, coal, oil, copper, and the strategic minerals—are things of great concern to us, we would be aiding national defense and the conservation aspects of this bill if we did not specifically bar the way to whatever small sums may be necessary to continue at their high standard such a fine series of conservation programs on the air as What Price America?

If the United States is to defend itself against all comers, we must preserve and conserve our natural resources. And if we are effectively to preserve and conserve our natural resources, we must see that all Americans are aware of the problem and of its importance.

LXXXVI—425

The Department of the Interior and other departments are interested in conservation. They have dramatized the need of it on the air, and I hope they will continue to dramatize. These programs are nonpartisan in character. They are not Republican or Democratic. No Member on either side of the aisle can charge that they are. They are conservation programs, dedicated to the cause of awakening the national conscience to the importance of preserving for ourselves and our posterity the great heritage of natural resources which a bountiful Providence bequeathed to us.

More than 105,000 Americans were so moved by the importance and need of conservation in the United States, as a result of one of these educational series alone, namely, What Price America?, that they wrote in for literature on the subject. That is the kind of education we need in this country of ours. That is why I hope we will not deprive any of these conservation agencies of the few thousand dollars that they might need for radio broadcasting.

If a foreign foe ever invades the United States—which God forbid—it will be because our Government and our people did not know how to conserve and utilize wisely our abundant natural resources. I hope the amendment I have offered will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 25. The Commissioner is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in section 1 hereof any claim on account of damage to or loss of privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the Works Progress Administration or the Work Projects Administration while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of \$500, or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 27, line 8, after "conclusive", insert a new section to read as follows: "Sec. 26. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be used for the printing or binding of books."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be confined to 2 minutes on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the members of the committee will refer to page 1121 of the committee hearings they will find there the statement of Mr. John B. Haggerty, chairman of the board of governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association, and president of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders.

From that statement it will appear that in the last few years W. P. A. has bound or rebound approximately 68,000,000 books depriving the skilled workers in this trade of the work. From the statement it will appear that the number of books bound is the equivalent of over 9,000,000 man-hours of work. From that statement it will appear that about 90 percent of the work done is regarded as inferior work, having been done by amateurs. From the statement it will also appear that W. P. A. has taken this work away from these skilled workers at a time when about 50 percent of the trade have been unemployed.

Mr. Haggerty made an appeal to your committee to eliminate any further appropriations in regard to bookbinding projects, characterizing them as, in his opinion, "an utter waste of money and in addition to being a discrimination" against those whom he represents.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Mr. Haggerty made out a strong case. I believe he has disclosed another case of

ruinous competition with legitimate skilled private industry. I offer this amendment in the interest of the workers for whom he speaks. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the determining factor which we must take into consideration in disposing of this amendment is that work is of a character which would rarely be undertaken but for the W. P. A. In the average community the books of the local schools and the local libraries would be left unbound and through disintegration incident to use many of the smaller libraries would lose books which would last indefinitely with a little repair and rebinding. In this way local patrons not only lose the books but local workmen would be deprived of the employment if this amendment were adopted. I recall that the first copy of the Arabian Nights Entertainment I ever read had both covers off and so many pages missing that I had difficulty disassociating Sinbad and Aladdin.

If you agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, you will deprive many a child of the privilege of reading the first and last chapters of books that are the rightful heritage of every American child. I trust the amendment will not be agreed to. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the joint resolution, as follows:

Sec. 26. The Commissioner is authorized to call to the attention of the city, county, and State governments the unemployment situation of that city, county, or State, and to seek the cooperation of the State or any subdivision thereof in meeting the unemployment problem.

Sec. 27. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any work project, employment, or relief aid under the appropriations in this joint resolution, or diverts, or attempts to divert or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of such appropriations, or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under any such appropriations, or attempts so to do, or assists in so doing, or who disposes of, or assists in disposing of, except for the account of the United States, any property upon which there exists a lien securing a loan made under the provisions of this joint resolution or the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this joint resolution.

Sec. 28. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to solicit, or knowingly be in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the campaign expenses of any individual or political party from any person receiving compensation or employment provided for by this joint resolution.

(b) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this joint resolution.

Sec. 29. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible by this joint resolution, or any other act of the Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate in any election or any political party.

(b) Except as may be required by the provisions of section 30 hereof, it shall be unlawful for any person to deprive, attempt to deprive, or threaten to deprive, by any means, any person of any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible by this joint resolution, on account of race, creed, color, or any political activity, support of, or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election.

(c) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and

not in substitution for, any other provisions of law, or of this joint resolution.

Sec. 30. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any administrative or supervisory capacity by any agency of the Federal Government, whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by this joint resolution, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the results thereof. While such persons shall retain the right to vote as they please and to express privately their opinions on all political subjects, they shall take no active part, directly or indirectly, in political management or in political campaigns or in political conventions.

(b) Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by this joint resolution shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this joint resolution.

Sec. 31. No part of any appropriation in this joint resolution shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person in a supervisory or administrative position who is a candidate for any State, district, county, or municipal office (such office requiring full time of such person and to which office a salary or per diem attaches), in any primary, general or special election, or who is serving as a campaign manager or assistant thereto for any such candidate.

Sec. 32. Reports of the operations under the appropriations in this joint resolution and the appropriations in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939, including a statement of the expenditures made and obligations incurred by classes of projects and amounts, shall be submitted to Congress by the President on or before the 31st of January in each of the next two regular sessions of Congress: *Provided*, That such reports shall be in lieu of the reports required by section 33 of such act.

Sec. 33. No funds appropriated in this joint resolution, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the States or local governmental agencies from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, stores, or plants which would manufacture, handle, process, or produce articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of sweetpotatoes) in competition with existing industries.

Sec. 34. None of the funds appropriated by this joint resolution shall be used for the manufacture, purchase, or construction of any naval vessel, any armament, munitions, or implement of war, for military or naval forces, and no funds herein appropriated or authorized shall be diverted or allocated to any other department or bureau for such purpose.

Sec. 35. No part of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be loaned or granted, except pursuant to an obligation incurred prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, to any State, or any of its political subdivisions or agencies, for the purpose of carrying out or assisting in carrying out any program or project of constructing, rebuilding, repairing, or replanning its penal or reformatory institutions, unless the President shall find that the projects to be financed with such loan or grant will not cause or promote competition of the products of convict labor with the products of free labor.

Sec. 36. In expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this joint resolution, for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any appropriation unit herein shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such Act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated, the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such Act, or (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, or (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law, or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment adding a new title to the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS: On page 33, after line 7, insert the following:

"TITLE II—FEDERAL PUBLIC BUILDINGS

"Sec. 201. Emergency construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia: For emergency construction of public-building projects outside of the District of Columbia (including the acquisition, where necessary, by purchase, condemnation, exchange, or otherwise of sites and additional land for such buildings; the de-

molition of old buildings where necessary, and construction, remodeling, or extension of buildings; rental of temporary quarters during construction, including moving expenses; purchase of necessary equipment for buildings and such additional administrative expenses and salaries as may be required solely for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a total amount of \$60,000,000 toward which amount \$10,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; such projects, including the sites therefor, to be selected by the Postmaster General and the Federal Works Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), acting jointly, from the public-building projects specified in House Document No. 177, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, as revised by them; and the projects so selected shall be carried out within the respective estimates of proposed limits of cost specified in such report as revised and those hereafter fixed by the Postmaster General and the Administrator under the provisions of this title, except that \$250,000 of the appropriation in this title shall be available for the augmentation of limits of cost of projects selected under the provisions of this title in an amount not exceeding 10 percent for any project: *Provided*, That with a view to relieving country-wide unemployment the Postmaster General and the Administrator, in the selection of towns or cities in which buildings are to be constructed, shall endeavor to distribute the projects equitably throughout the country so far as may be consistent with the needs of the public service; and the Postmaster General and the Administrator may also select for prosecution under this program such projects not included in such revised report as in their judgment are economically sound and advantageous to the public service: *Provided further*, That the Administrator is authorized to direct the preparation of all sketches, estimates, plans, and specifications (including supervision and inspection thereof), and to enter into all contracts necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title: *Provided further*, That the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts for any or all of the projects selected under this program in amounts not exceeding the respective estimated total costs of individual projects, and he is hereby authorized, when deemed by him desirable and advantageous, to employ, by contract or otherwise, the personal services of temporary professional, technical, or nontechnical employees to such extent as may be required to carry out the purposes of this title, without reference to civil-service laws, rules, regulations, or to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of land or sites for the purposes of Federal public buildings and in the construction of such buildings provided for in this title, the provisions of sections 305 and 306 of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended, shall apply.

"Sec. 202. The provisions of title I of this joint resolution shall not be applicable to this title.

"Sec. 203. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Public Buildings Appropriation Act of 1940.'"

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment, first, that it is not germane to the joint resolution, this being a relief bill, and the amendment being one authorizing a public-buildings program and making appropriations therefor, and second, that it is not germane to this part of the joint resolution.

This amendment is absolutely foreign to the very purpose of the joint resolution. This joint resolution is not a general construction authorization program at all, it is simply supposed to be a relief program all the way through, while the amendment is an authorization for a building construction program and an appropriation therefor. Further, the amendment is offered at a point in the joint resolution where limitations are provided against improper and irregular expenditures of funds that have been appropriated in other parts of the joint resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I offer one observation on the point of order? If I could tell from the reading of the so-called second title to this joint resolution, it contains a provision that none of the provisions of the joint resolution shall apply. In those circumstances, I have grave doubt that it is germane to the pending resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, this title is in the same language that has been carried in similar bills of this particular nature, and it is my understanding that this language has heretofore been held in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair is ready to rule. In the opinion of the Chair, in view of the fact that this is a bill for work and work relief and provides specifi-

cally, in certain portions of it, as in lines 14 and 15, of page 3, for public buildings, the point of order should not be sustained, and the Chair would cite in this connection a ruling that was made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN], on January 13, 1939, when an amendment was offered to the relief bill by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] to this effect:

At the end of line 3, page 3, following the committee and other amendments, add the following: "*Provided further*, That \$150,000,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be used in the erection of public buildings for the accommodation of second- and third-class post offices in various States and towns, cities, or municipalities wherein such buildings are to be located shall first furnish the Government with an approved site or place therefor."

In ruling upon that amendment the then Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN], said:

Section 1 of the Public Works Appropriation Act of 1938 provides, among other things, for public buildings, parks, and other recreational facilities, etc.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina merely seeks to allocate part of the funds herein appropriated for that purpose.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order and holds the amendment to be germane.

In view of the fact that there are specific designations of public buildings and appropriations made for them in this joint resolution, which is for work and work relief, and inasmuch as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi proposes erection of public buildings which would give work and work relief, it seems to the Chair that it is germane to the bill, and the Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I call the Chair's attention to the fact that the Chair was mistaken in quoting the title. The title is "Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief." The word "work" alone does not appear.

The CHAIRMAN. But the joint resolution, the Chair will say, refers specifically by its terms to public buildings and makes appropriations for various public buildings, and, in the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] is in keeping with the purpose of the joint resolution and with the various provisions in the resolution, and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in 17 minutes, 5 minutes to be consumed by the gentleman from Mississippi, 3 minutes by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], 5 minutes by myself, and 2 minutes by the gentleman from Montana, and 2 minutes by the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many hundreds of millions of dollars are involved in this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has reported the amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I shall object until we know whether we are only going to have 17 minutes on a matter involving hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The amendment provides \$10,000,000 of appropriations and \$50,000,000 of authorization. The entire building program proposed in the amendment would aggregate \$60,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have about 3 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, which will include 3 minutes for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment at the desk and I wish to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the request only refers to the pending amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi and any amendment thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, this title proposes numerous public-buildings-construction projects outside of the District of Columbia and authorizes appropriations of \$60,000,000, \$10,000,000 of which is appropriated in this act, the \$10,000,000 being for the acquisition of sites, plans, and specifications, and the beginning of construction of buildings. The amendment is identical with similar amendments that have been passed by Congress in other sessions in the last 6 or 8 years. Selections are to be made by the Postmaster General and the Federal works administrations from projects which have been held economically sound by them in public document dated February 2, 1939, which has been revised up to date. It further provides for the equitable distribution of this money throughout the country so that no section of it will be discriminated against. It provides for standard specifications, so that there will be no fraud. These, in substance, are the provisions of the proposed amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Let me finish my statement and then I shall be delighted to yield. There are 1,500 of these approved projects throughout the United States, and this proposal will take care of approximately 450 of them. A combined Government and post-office building will be constructed, or a building in existence will be remodeled, or substations will be constructed, and because of the fact that an equitable distribution is provided in this title, no section can be ignored.

In addition, since only \$10,000,000 is appropriated, the total amount, as carried in this bill including this appropriation, will not exceed Budget estimates. As a matter of fact, with this appropriation added, the bill will still be over \$4,000,000 under Budget estimates.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. MAY. In the event a post-office building is constructed, will that be done through the Procurement Division of the Treasury and the supervision of the Post Office Department, or by the local W. P. A.?

Mr. COLLINS. It would be done by the Post Office Department and the Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. About what does the gentleman's amendment contemplate giving to each congressional district?

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman can divide 60 million dollars by about 450 or some such number as that, and he will reach a rather accurate idea. There is sufficient authorization so that if a building is larger than, say, 60 or 75 thousand dollars, there is money in this bill to provide for other types of construction. There is no politics in the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. In Minneapolis we are divided into two congressional districts, and we have great need for a new Federal court building and branch post office combined. The Treasury Department's recommendation, which is, I think, one of those 1,500 the gentleman refers to, calls for \$1,900,000 for that purpose.

Mr. COLLINS. There would be ample money in this bill to take care of projects of that particular nature.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is quite a large sum of money and I wondered if this contemplated buildings of that size.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. First, whether this amendment will increase the amount of this appropriation, or is it merely an allocation?

Mr. COLLINS. This title does not earmark money. This is in addition to the \$975,000,000 elsewhere provided for in the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does it provide that each congressional district shall have at least one building?

Mr. COLLINS. It does not do that. It provides for equitable distribution of money throughout the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will it cause more post offices in our districts?

Mr. COLLINS. It will provide buildings wherever needed if sound economically.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just before election?

Mr. COLLINS. No. They cannot be constructed for at least a year from this date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobbs] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is of vital importance to every person in this House. It is evidence of the wisdom of that community which provided a fence at the top of the cliff rather than an ambulance down in the valley. This will keep people off relief by providing far more gainful employment. It will put at least one public building, erected by Uncle Sam, in every congressional district. It will not take a dime away from the appropriation made by this bill for work relief and relief. It is in addition to that. When this appropriation is added to the other the total will still be some \$4,000,000 within the Budget.

It will produce employment in three different and distinct ways: First, by keeping at work and by augmenting the number of workers in the industries providing the materials out of which these buildings will be constructed. That provides a wide range of employment back of the actual buildings. That will touch about 80 percent of all the heavy building industries in the United States.

Second, it will provide employment for those local workers who are qualified to participate in the actual building of the buildings.

Third, there will be a resurgence of local pride because of the fine new building going up in the town, which will spread the desire for local improvements all over each little city. Such desire always produces results, and each improvement causes another. So the whole town is improved by reason of the erection of the new post-office building, and employment is multiplied.

In those three ways this will do more to stimulate employment and to prevent unemployment than any money that will be in this bill. It does not make this bill exceed the Budget. It is in addition to and not in subtraction from the amount of this bill. We submit most seriously that it is the wisest kind of amendment that can be engrafted upon this good bill. It will make a good bill better.

In addition to these considerations, it should be borne in mind that each new post-office building erected replaced quarters for the use of which Uncle Sam is now paying rent. The saving of this rental outlay will constitute another dividend upon the investment we are here advocating.

Make no mistake, this amendment is our only chance of this session for any new post-office buildings; and such a program is not "pork," but brains.

The dollars which will be put to work when we adopt this amendment will be at least as well invested as any dollar in this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'Connor] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this amendment. I spoke in favor of projects during general debate on this bill.

I have 16 eligible cities in my own district, all needing these buildings. Under the present plan of building post offices it would require about 45 years before the present needs of my district are met.

I want to add a word in addition to what the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobbs] said. You will not

only get needed and permanent improvements by this appropriation, but you will likewise save the Government a lot of expense in paying rent for places to house post-office facilities.

In places where other governmental agencies are housed we are also paying rents to private persons. The Government will be saved that expense. In addition to furnishing employment, the Government will save money out of the investment in the end.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not the best drawing feature of the amendment the fact that we get a post office in every district at this time?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And that will help us in the election, will it not?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Maybe not, but it will help the people get work. That is the main thing, and that is the primary purpose of this bill—to give work where it is needed, and to relieve suffering.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Can the gentleman assure me that my district will get some of that "gravy"?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, you will if one is needed. I will say this, we have on the authority of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], a member of this committee, that an appropriation of \$60,000,000 will provide for the construction of a post-office building in every congressional district throughout the United States.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. There are 20 congressional districts in the city of New York. Are you going to erect 20 post offices in the city of New York? [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Federal buildings will only be built where there is need for them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I have heard it said that the W. P. A. program is eventually doomed in this country because of the fact that there are certain parts of the country that do not have any more feasible projects on which men can be put to work, no matter how much they may need employment. That may be true of certain communities in the eastern part of the country, but it certainly is not true of the western portion of this country. Out where the West begins the world is new and in the making.

In an official report made 2 years ago I find that the State of Arizona had 23 towns eligible and in need of post offices or Federal buildings. There have been about three new post offices erected during the time I have been in Congress. I believe we are now in need of at least 20 new Federal buildings in my State. In some cases to my knowledge the need is imperative.

I have complained, as you have, of W. P. A. projects that are really not highly useful, not constructive. I detest the term "leaf raking and boondoggling." I have not seen so much of such things as some opponents of W. P. A. profess to have seen. If we are going to have to give employment at public expense, for God's sake let it be on substantial construction. That, I believe, this amendment will provide. Call it "pork," if you please; call it whatever you please. It is not only giving people employment in every part of this country, but it is giving us the type of construction which we are sadly needing, and I think this will balance the types of work for the skilled and the unskilled.

I favor the amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to add a public-buildings program costing \$60,000,000 to a relief bill—it is supposed to be a relief bill, anyway. Is it going to be a little bit further from a relief bill? Are we going to go ahead and authorize another \$60,000,000 and appropriate directly \$10,000,000 above the Budget, every dollar of it without the President's recommendation at this time, and start on a program of putting up a building in every section of the country? And are we going to attempt to do this at a time when every dollar we can rake and scrape together is going to be needed for national defense?

These projects will go regardless of relief or employment need; they will go wherever it is determined by the gentleman who will have jurisdiction over it—the Postmaster General and the Public Works Administration—wherever it is determined by them the project should be embarked upon. They will be no contribution whatever toward relieving unemployment in places where it needs to be relieved.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield, I have only 3 minutes. I did not ask the gentleman to yield to me.

I hope this House will have a sense of responsibility in meeting this proposition and that it will not support a program for adding \$60,000,000 of authorization and \$10,000,000 of appropriations above the Budget, which is absolutely unjustifiable at this time. There are many, many places that lack public buildings. On the other hand, we are getting along, and until we get through this international emergency we should not reach out and spread our wings so far that we shall not have money enough for the things that are absolutely necessary.

We are up against it now, appropriating money out of the Treasury that is not there and is not going to be there. Why should we go further in bankrupting America? I hope this House will vote against this amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we live in a troubled period in the history of the world. The American people are facing today a situation the gravity of which we dare not estimate on this floor. We must conserve every asset. We must husband every resource. We must scrutinize every expenditure. And the proposition offered here conforms to none of these requirements. The amendment proposes to spend \$60,000,000 at a time when we are taking up a defense program which for the time being should have priority over all but indispensable expenditures. The proposal to spend \$60,000,000 for new buildings which can be postponed without serious disadvantage interferes with the defense program in three ways at least. It absorbs funds needed for prompt prosecution of the program. It absorbs materials which must be purchased in the open markets in competition with defense orders. And it employs mechanics and skilled workmen of all the trades needed in the construction of factories, plants, hangars, and warehouses at a time when there is already a shortage in skilled labor available for such purposes.

No purpose served in the amendment can excuse or justify the proposition to take away from that imperative and urgent program at such a time as this workmen, material, and money to construct post-office buildings in some rural community where commodious quarters can be rented at a saving to the Government.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I much regret that I cannot yield at this time. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is subject to every criticism that could be offered. In the first place, this is an amendment to borrow \$60,000,000. It is not an amendment to appropriate the money, because it is not in the Treasury to appropriate. It is an amendment to go out and borrow \$60,000,000 we do not have, that we are not going to have, and, what is more important, \$60,000,000 we are going to need for something else. There is no Budget

estimate for such an appropriation. The committee has not considered it. It is in every way outside the rules which ordinarily hedge about an appropriation submitted to the House.

And, last, let us not camouflage the real incentive lurking behind the public-building program. I realize what a temptation it is to dangle before us a new post-office building in every congressional district right here before election, but we have reached a place when we must exercise self-restraint. We must tighten our belts. The American people must steel themselves to meet actual privation. We must make sacrifices as a people and as individuals. And the first place for us to show self-control and the first place to inure ourselves to sacrifices is right here on this floor, beginning with ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today is a great humanitarian measure, one which reflects credit upon American ideals and American civilization. Let us not sully this splendid program; let us not vary the high tenor of this bill by making it a "pork" bill. Let us keep it as we have started it—a bill to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to house the shelterless, to rehabilitate the hopeless, through opportunities for honest work at an honest wage.

I trust the amendment will be voted down.
[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLLINS) there were—ayes 50, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 33, line 7, add a new title as follows:

"TITLE II

"SECTION 1. There is hereby appropriated to the Public Works Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500,000,000, and the Commissioner of Public Works (in this section called the Commissioner) is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President, to make loans from this fund to States, Territories, possessions, or political subdivisions, or any instrumentalities or agencies thereof (in this section called public bodies) to finance or aid in financing projects which will provide new employment; (b) to organizations created pursuant to law or under the authority of any public body to operate without profit (in this section called nonprofit organizations), to finance or aid in financing projects (including any and all constituent parts thereof) which will produce new employment, will be devoted to public use, and are within any one of the following classes: Hospitals, health centers, clinics, colleges, schools, recreational facilities, or facilities for the handling and storage of farm products; and (c) to public bodies and nonprofit organizations for the temporary operation and maintenance of projects for such period as the Commissioner shall deem necessary for the security of any obligations acquired hereunder.

"Sec. 2. Every such loan shall be evidenced by an obligation or obligations, general or special, of the public body or nonprofit organization to which made, shall bear interest upon the unpaid principal at the rate of 1 percent per annum, shall be secured in such manner as the Commissioner shall determine to be necessary reasonably to assure repayment of the loan, and shall be repayable at one time or from time to time within a period not to exceed (1) 50 years from the first advancement of funds thereunder or (2) the anticipated period of usefulness of the project for which such loan is made, whichever is less, as determined by the Commissioner, prior to such first advancement.

"Sec. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this title the Commissioner is authorized—

"(a) To prescribe, from time to time, terms and conditions not inconsistent with the provisions of this section.

"(b) To sell any bonds, securities, or other obligations acquired hereunder, or any security therefor.

"(c) To accept (1) in exchange and substitution for any bonds, securities, or other obligations of the same or any other public body or nonprofit organization, whether of the same or longer maturities or otherwise differing, which, in the determination of the Commissioner, are more desirable than those so acquired; and (2) in exchange and substitution for any bonds, securities or other obligations acquired hereunder, any other security, which in the determination of the Commissioner is more desirable than that so acquired.

"(d) To authorize expenditures for contract stenographic report-

ing services; supplies and equipment; purchase and exchange of law books, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; travel expenses, including the expense of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized; rental at the seat of government and elsewhere; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding; and such other expenses as he may determine necessary to the accomplishment of the objectives of this title.

"(e) The Commissioner is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such executive and administrative assistants, a general counsel and such other attorneys, and such experts, special consultants, and regional supervisors, and subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint such other employees as he may deem necessary as a regular staff to carry out the purposes of this title, and to prescribe their authorities, duties, responsibilities, and tenure: *Provided*, That if the Commissioner shall, within 6 months after the date of the approval of this act, certify to the United States Civil Service Commission that any employee of the Public Works Administration has rendered satisfactory services for at least 6 months prior to the date of approval of this act and is to be assigned to the regular staff of the Administration, and such employees shall, within 6 months after such certification, pass such appropriate noncompetitive tests of fitness as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, such employee shall thereupon acquire the same status as if certified after examination by the Civil Service Commission.

"Sec. 4. The Commissioner shall require (a) that all workmen, laborers, and mechanics employed in the construction of any project financed hereunder shall be paid without subsequent deduction or rebate on any account not less than the wages determined by the Commissioner, or in accordance with local law, to be the wages prevailing for the corresponding classes of workmen, laborers, and mechanics employed on projects of a character similar to the work in the locality where the project is to be situated; and (b) that no workman, laborer, or mechanic employed in the construction of any such project shall be compelled to work a greater number of hours per week than the applicable maximum established by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or be compensated at a rate less than the applicable minimum-wage rate established by said act, whether or not the employment of such workman, laborer, or mechanic is subject to the provision of said act.

"Sec. 5. The Public Works Administration in the Federal Works Agency is hereby continued, and all provisions of law existing on the date of enactment hereof relating to limitations of time for the continuance of the Public Works Administration, and the receipt of applications, are hereby repealed. The Commissioner shall act under the direction and supervision of the Federal Works Administrator.

"Sec. 6. Not to exceed \$10,000,000 of the fund shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri (interrupting reading of the amendment). As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment proposes to reestablish the P. W. A.?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I wonder if it would be agreeable to the members of the Committee to dispense with the reading of the amendment?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the amendment is printed on page 3024 of the Appendix of the RECORD?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment and that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not want to be precluded from making a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman would not be precluded from making a point of order under this unanimous-consent request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the rest of the bill, it being a program involving the granting of funds to States, cities, counties, and other municipalities without any requirement that the money be used for relief. The title of the pending bill is "An act to provide for work relief and relief," and the gentleman's amendment has nothing whatever to do with a relief bill, and is therefore not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. In accordance with the former ruling of the Chair, and the further fact that the bill before us pro-

vides for funds to be paid to States, Territories, and so forth, the Chair thinks the amendment germane, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes, 3 minutes to be reserved by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I think every Member of the House will agree that the work of the Public Works Administration has been one of the most constructive things that has been done in recent years from the standpoint of an attack on the problem of unemployment. It means not only direct employment at the site, but a very large amount of additional employment in industries supplying materials, transportation, and so forth. In the second place, it has been pointed out by many Members in the course of this debate that there were certain things to be said for a program like the P. W. A. program as compared to a program like W. P. A. under certain circumstances.

My first proposition is that the P. W. A. will die within a couple of months, unless some provision of this kind is agreed to. If this amendment of mine is adopted, it will not die but will continue to do the work it has been doing in the past.

The next point I want to make is this: P. W. A. has at this moment 3,000 applications for non-Federal projects already approved, projects which are needed, where local communities are ready to do their part, and which can be undertaken in a very short space of time. The next point I want to make, and I ask you to listen carefully, is this: It is true that the amendment says that \$500,000,000 is to be appropriated for the P. W. A., but every dollar of that is to be used for recoverable loans. The amendment provides for no grants at all. The money is entirely for loans to public bodies which will provide new employment in the building of schools, hospitals, recreational facilities, highways, airports, and things of that character, such as P. W. A. has done in the past. They are things we cannot neglect or forget—especially not now.

Another provision of the amendment states that there shall be paid the regular prevailing wages on all such projects. The provisions of this amendment, I may say, were drawn with great care by people who know their business. It is not just a fly-by-night proposition that somebody thought up but a very carefully drawn amendment in proper form to provide the continuance of the work of the Public Works Administration for the purpose of doing this kind of a job.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have under all circumstances to remember that this attack on unemployment is a part of national defense and one of the most important parts. If we want to arrive at the proper kind of public-works program, if we are going to have a long-range program, if we are going to have the W. P. A. type for certain people and certain kinds of work, we will have to have the P. W. A. type for other kinds of work and other circumstances where it can be used. For these reasons I ask the Members to consider this proposition with real earnestness, in spite of the lateness of the hour.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Will this program furnish work under contract at the prevailing rate of wages and by skilled labor?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Altogether.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. How can any man who opposes W. P. A. because it gives work to unskilled labor only oppose this proposition?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is what I am anxious to find out. This is a regular P. W. A. program, which has

always been a program of contract work and opportunity for employment of skilled labor and always at the prevailing rate of wages.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the House is not in a particularly legislative mood at the moment, but I think if the Members will consider this from the long-range point of view, and if they will realize that as a matter of fact every dollar contained in this amendment will be repaid to the Federal Treasury, they will see that there is a soundness to this proposition which it should be difficult for them to turn down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] seeks to revive the Public Works Administration. There should be no disparagement of the fine place that organization has had in our recovery program. However, Congress at the first session refused to make any further appropriation for continuance of P. W. A., except on a liquidation basis. Likewise, the first session of this Congress rejected a program for a revival of spend and lend for public works. The P. W. A. is now practically liquidated. The organization has been pretty well dismantled. The amendment just offered would rehabilitate and reassemble the personnel and start the program over again. Furthermore, the amendment, as offered, is a broadening of the authority which P. W. A. has enjoyed under previous laws. It provides money at a very low rate of interest—1 percent—which is not justified for this sort of a program at this time. Laudable as the purposes of the program may be, it is open to many of the objections which I have just previously raised to the public-buildings amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS]. We do not have the money for this proposal; it has not been considered or studied by the committee; it has not been recommended by the executive branch of the Government. The measure to which it is offered is a bill for work relief of needy unemployed; that relief will be furnished promptly. The projects to be undertaken under the amendment now under consideration are so-called heavy type of construction. They do not furnish employment to the same numbers of workers that the W. P. A. program furnishes per million dollars of expenditure. It would take this program considerable time to get under way due to the disorganized state of the agency, and the length of time required to get the projects in, approved, and put under contract. For these and other reasons which time does not permit me to enumerate, the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VOORHIS of California) there were—ayes 26, noes 110.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN A. HALL: On page 33, after line 7, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 37. One million dollars of the sums herein provided shall be allotted to a non-partisan commission of 11 taxpayers, 5 to be named by the House and 5 by the Senate, the chairman to be chosen by the 10 thus named, it being provided that no member of such Commission shall be a public officeholder or affiliated with any organized spending minority group. The Commission shall be invested with power of subpoena and charged with a laboratory investigation of relief with reference to its causes and its effects upon the economic and sociological structure of the United States and particularly with reference to its effects on the recipients of relief. Members of the Commission shall serve without pay but all necessary expenses incurred in the investigation by the members of the Commission, their paid secretaries, investigators, clerks, and stenographers shall be a proper charge against this appropriation. And the Commission shall be continued with each appropriation of relief moneys by Congress with appropriation for the work of the committee at the rate of 2 percent of all such relief moneys appropriated and shall report to Congress on June 30 and December 31 of each year."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the joint resolution.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. May I ask if the gentleman will withhold his point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. At this late hour of the session I must object to that, but I would suggest that the gentleman extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is not germane. Almost this exact point was passed upon by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] on January 13, 1939, when the relief bill was under consideration. An amendment was offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER] to this effect:

At the end of the bill add the following: "Provided further, That a joint committee consisting of nine Members of the House and nine Members of the Senate be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, respectively, to forthwith investigate the relief problem and report out within 90 days a sound program of Federal relief and reemployment."

In ruling upon the point of order against that amendment the gentleman from North Carolina said:

Obviously, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is not in order, as it deals with a subject over which another committee of the House would have entire jurisdiction.

Inasmuch as the Committee on Appropriations does not have jurisdiction of the matter contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the hour is getting late, and I regret that I have asked the Committee's indulgence in giving me an opportunity to be heard on my amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I regret to have to make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the joint resolution; he is speaking on his amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would rather listen to the other gentleman.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of saying a few words regarding the W. P. A. and the administration of national relief as it is being handled in this country today. I do not believe there is anyone in this room who will gainsay the statement that W. P. A. in its very essence is merely experimental and cannot be carried on for an unlimited length of time. When the President of the United States and the Executive Branch of this Government, as well as the Congress of the United States, assume that the administration of national relief as it is now administered is the panacea or remedy for the tremendous problem we as Americans are facing today, then the President and this Congress are assuming something that is entirely wrong. The amendment which I offered and which was ruled out had for its object probing the national relief set-up and determining abuses and remedies made obvious by mistakes in relief administration. It was my hope that after going into the subject and making an examination of the facts, conclusions could be drawn regarding the future administration of relief and its relation to unemployment.

It is for this reason I have offered this amendment, and although I do not wish in any way to oppose the desires of the chairman in this matter, I may say that I have presented it as a substitute, and as offering an opportunity for developing some future substitute for the present method of handling the problem we are facing. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WARREN] having assumed the chair; Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 544) making appropriations for work relief and relief, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Johnson of Oklahoma amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment; if not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the so-called Johnson of Oklahoma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: On pages 16 and 17, strike out all of section 11.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 181, noes 114.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All those in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Fourteen Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a reading of the engrossed copy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 544 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the resolution back to the House with the following changes in those parts of the joint resolution relating to relief and its administration by the Work Projects Administration: Provide for allocation of funds to State, Territories, municipalities, and the District of Columbia by grants-in-aid to enable them to carry out the relief programs determined and administered by them, and in which they participate through reasonable financial and other contributions.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to recommit the bill.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan comes too late, coming after the motion to recommit.

Mr. **HOFFMAN**. I made it once before.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman did not insist upon it.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 356, nays 21, answered "present" 1, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—356

Alexander	Dingell	Johnson, Lyndon	Peterson, Fla.
Allen, Ill.	Dirksen	Johnson, Okla.	Pfeifer
Allen, La.	Disney	Johnson, W. Va.	Pierce
Allen, Pa.	Ditter	Jones, Ohio	Pittenger
Andersen, H. Carl	Dondero	Jones, Tex.	Poage
Anderson, Calif.	Doughton	Jonkman	Polk
Anderson, Mo.	Doxey	Kean	Powers
Andresen, A. H.	Duncan	Keefe	Rabaut
Arends	Dworschak	Dunn	Ramspeck
Arnold	Eberharter	Keller	Rankin
Austin	Edelstein	Eaton	Rayburn
Barnes	Elliott	Kennedy, Martin	Reece, Tenn.
Barry	Ellis	Kennedy, Md.	Reed, Ill.
Barton, N. Y.	Eiston	Kennedy, Michael	Rees, Kans.
Bates, Ky.	Engel	Keogh	Richards
Bates, Mass.	Englebright	Kerr	Risk
Beam	Faddis	Kinzer	Robinson, Utah
Beckworth	Fay	Kirwan	Rodgers, Pa.
Bell	Fenton	Kleberg	Rodgers, Mass.
Bender	Ferguson	Knutson	Rogers, Okla.
Blackney	Fernandez	Kocialkowski	Romjue
Bland	Fish	Kramer	Routzohn
Bloom	Fitzpatrick	Kunkel	Rutherford
Boehne	Flaherty	Lambertson	Ryan
Boland	Flannagan	Landis	Sabath
Bolles	Flannery	Lanham	Sacks
Bolton	Folger	Larrabee	Sandager
Boren	Ford, Leland M.	Lea	Sasscer
Boykin	Ford, Thomas F.	Leavy	Satterfield
Bradley, Mich.	Fries	LeCompte	Schaefer, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Fulmer	Lesinski	Schaefer, Wis.
Brewster	Gamble	Lewis, Colo.	Schiffler
Brooks	Garrett	Lewis, Ohio	Schuetz
Brown, Ga.	Gartner	Luce	Schulte
Brown, Ohio	Gathings	Ludlow	Schwert
Bryson	Gavagan	Lynch	Scrugham
Buck	Gearhart	McAndrews	Secombe
Buckler, Minn.	Gehrman	McArdle	Secrest
Buckley, N. Y.	Gerlach	McCormack	Seger
Bulwinkle	Geyer, Calif.	McGranery	Shanley
Burdick	Gibbs	McGregor	Sheppard
Burgin	Gifford	McKeough	Sheridan
Byrne, N. Y.	Gilchrist	McLaughlin	Smith, Conn.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gillie	McLeod	Smith, Ill.
Byron	Goodwin	McMillan, Clara	Smith, W. Va.
Caldwell	Gore	McMillan, John L.	Snyder
Camp	Gossett	Maas	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Graham	Maclejewski	South
Cannon, Mo.	Grant, Ala.	Magnuson	Sparkman
Carlson	Grant, Ind.	Mahon	Spence
Carter	Gregory	Maloney	Springer
Cartwright	Griffith	Marcantonio	Steagall
Case, S. Dak.	Gross	Marshall	Stearns, N. H.
Casey, Mass.	Guyer, Kans.	Martin, Ill.	Stefan
Celler	Gwynne	Martin, Iowa	Sullivan
Chilperfield	Hall, Edwin A.	Massingale	Summer, Ill.
Church	Hall, Leonard W.	May	Sutphin
Clark	Harrington	Michener	Sweet
Clason	Hart	Miller	Talle
Claypool	Harter, N. Y.	Mills, Ark.	Tarver
Clevenger	Hartley	Mills, La.	Tenerowicz
Cluett	Havenner	Monkiewicz	Terry
Cochran	Healey	Monroney	Thill
Coffee, Nebr.	Hendricks	Moser	Thomas, Tex.
Coffee, Wash.	Hennings	Mott	Thomason
Cole, Md.	Hess	Mouton	Tolan
Collins	Hill	Mundt	Treadway
Colmer	Hinshaw	Murdoch, Ariz.	Van Zandt
Connery	Hobbs	Murdoch, Utah	Vincent, Ky.
Cooper	Holmes	Murray	Vinson, Ga.
Corbett	Hook	Myers	Voorhis, Calif.
Costello	Hope	Nelson	Vorys, Ohio
Courtney	Horton	Nichols	Vreeland
Cravens	Houston	Norrell	Walter
Creal	Hull	Norton	Ward
Crosser	Hunter	O'Brien	Warren
Crowe	Izac	O'Connor	Welch
Crowther	Jacobsen	O'Day	West
Cullen	Jeffries	O'Leary	Wheat
Curtis	Jenkins, Ohio	Oliver	Whittington
D'Alesandro	Jenks, N. H.	O'Neal	Wigglesworth
Darden, Va.	Jennings	Osmer	Williams, Mo.
Davis	Jensen	O'Toole	Winter
Delaney	Johns	Pace	Wolcott
Dempsey	Johnson, Ill.	Parsons	Wolfenden, Pa.
DeRouen	Johnson, Luther A.	Patman	Wolverton, N. J.
Dickstein		Patrick	Woodruff, Mich.
Dies		Patton	Youngdahl
		Pearson	Zimmerman

NAYS—21

Andrews	Hoffman	Robertson	Thomas, N. J.
Burch	Kilburn	Rockefeller	Wadsworth
Cole, N. Y.	McLean	Short	Williams, Del.
Crawford	Peterson, Ga.	Smith, Ohio	
Drewry	Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Va.	
Hancock	Rich	Taber	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hawks

NOT VOTING—52

Ball	Green	Mansfield	Sumners, Tex.
Barden, N. C.	Halleck	Martin, Mass.	Sweeney
Chapman	Hare	Mason	Taylor
Cooley	Harness	Merritt	Thorkelson
Cox	Jarman	Mitchell	Tibbott
Culkin	Jarrett	Plumley	Tinkham
Cummings	Johnson, Ind.	Randolph	Wallgren
Darrow	Kee	Robison, Ky.	Weaver
Douglas	Kilday	Shafer, Mich.	Welchel
Durham	Kitchens	Shannon	White, Idaho
Edmiston	Lemke	Simpson	White, Ohio
Ellis	McDowell	Smith, Wash.	Wood
Ford, Miss.	McGehee	Starnes, Ala.	Woodrum, Va.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wood (for) with Mr. Woodrum of Virginia (against).
Mr. Robison of Kentucky (for) with Mr. Hawks (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Martin Mass.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Barden of North Carolina with Mr. Harness.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Simpson.
Mr. Cox with Mr. McDowell.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Tibbott.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Thorkelson.
Mr. Kitchens with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Welch with Mr. White of Ohio.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Ball.
Mr. Green with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Wallgren with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Merritt.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. **HAWKS**. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I have a pair with the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. **ROBISON**. Had he been present, he would have voted "yea." Therefore I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. **RUTHERFORD**. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. **McDOWELL**, Mr. **TIBBOTT**, Mr. **JARRETT**, and Mr. **SIMPSON**, are unavoidably detained. Had they been present, they would have voted "yea."

Mr. **POAGE**. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. **KILDAY**, is absent on account of the serious illness of his mother. Were he present, he would have voted "yea."

Mr. **ARNOLD**. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois, Mr. **MITCHELL**, was here and took part in the deliberations on the bill, and was called away about 2 hours ago on important public business. I am authorized to announce that had he been present he would have voted "yea."

Mr. **LEWIS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that my colleague from Colorado, Mr. **CUMMINGS**, is indisposed this afternoon. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea."

Mr. **SCRUGHAM**. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Idaho, Mr. **WHITE**, is unavoidably detained. He asked me to announce that if he were present he would have voted "yea."

Mr. **BURDICK**. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. **LEMKE**, took part in the debate, but was called away this morning. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea."

Mr. **GRANT** of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. **HALLECK**, Mr. **HARNES**, and Mr. **JOHNSON** of Indiana, are necessarily absent. Had they been present, they would have voted "yea."

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. **RANDOLPH**, is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would have voted "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I received the following letter from the Honorable Robert Moses, chairman of the State Council of Parks of New York.

I wish the entire membership will find the time to read his letter, as well as my answer.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
STATE COUNCIL OF PARKS,
Albany, N. Y., May 21, 1940.

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My attention has been called to the fact that S. J. Res. 92, introduced by Senator NYE, has been favorably reported out of committee and will be debated upon before the Senate. I understand that this resolution will be introduced in the House and presumably will be referred to the House Judiciary Committee since all previous resolutions dealing with this subject have been referred to that committee. Attempts have been made to pass this resolution for the past few years but so far have not been successful.

This resolution requests the Attorney General of the United States "to institute and to maintain to final determination, appropriate judicial proceedings for the purpose of asserting, ascertaining, and establishing the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all submerged lands under the territorial waters of the United States."

I am informed by distinguished counsel that there is no basis for the assertion of such title or property right in the United States, especially with respect to any lands under water along the coast of New York State, and that the courts would not uphold such an assertion.

The trouble is that if such an assertion is made by the Federal Government it throws a cloud on the titles of the State, its municipalities, and its citizens. Any businessman will agree that no private citizen would spend money to improve shore property for business or other purposes, and no lending institution would advance money for such improvements if the Federal Government claimed ownership of such lands. The mere threat of pending litigation would be enough to paralyze prospective improvements on land adjoining or near the tidal waters of the State. It might take years before a final decision is arrived at which would clean up this question, and in the meantime irreparable damage would be done.

The city of New York, under grants from the State, has tremendous investments in dock properties and in parks and playgrounds which depend for their usefulness on the ownership by the city of the lands under water. Under my jurisdiction much needed improvements are being made every day on such lands. Our program for use of these properties for recreational purposes is seriously jeopardized by this extraordinary assertion by the Government that it, instead of the city, is the owner of the adjacent lands under water.

The State also has acquired large tracts of land adjoining tidal waters for the Long Island State Park Commission, of which I am the president, and has transferred jurisdiction of the lands under water adjoining such upland to the said commission to be improved for recreational purposes. While the more enlightened people must know that this claim of the Government can never be upheld, the mischief that is caused by such a claim by encouraging the opponents of this progressive program is incalculable.

Without doubt the Navy Department has taken advantage of the present crisis in the war in Europe and has managed to get favorable action on this resolution on the plea that it is necessary for purposes of defense. This is a perfectly absurd assertion to make as the lands are under the control of the Government whether they are owned by the States or by citizens of the State. These lands and the deposits under them can be taken by the Government immediately in case of war, the same as the Government takes anything else it needs for its defense. The matter of ownership and how much is to be paid for what is taken is left to the courts to decide in the future. The litigation that will be engendered by such an assertion by the United States as this resolution calls for will not be ended until long after any war that we may get into will be concluded. The fact that the Attorney General does not proceed to assert the Government's claim without an order from Congress is proof that the Attorney General is not convinced of the legality of the claim.

The burden is on you and your associates to protect the interests of the people you represent.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT MOSES, Chairman.

MAY 23, 1940.

HON. ROBERT MOSES,

Chairman, State Council of Parks, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: Yesterday I received a telegram from Dock Commissioner McKenzie expressing his official opposition to S. J. Res. 92. His telegram gave me the impression that the interests of the city of New York and certain property owners would be adversely affected if this resolution were adopted. In your letter dated May 21 referring to the same resolution you state:

"While the more enlightened people must know that this claim of the Government can never be upheld, the mischief that is caused by such a claim by encouraging the opponents of this progressive program is incalculable."

"Without doubt the Navy Department has taken advantage of the present crisis in the war in Europe and has managed to get favorable action on this resolution on the plea that it is necessary for purposes of defense. This is a perfectly absurd assertion to make, as the lands are under the control of the Government whether they are owned by the States or by citizens of the State. These lands and the deposits under them can be taken by the Government immediately in case of war, the same as the Government takes anything else it needs for its defense. The matter of ownership and how much is to be paid for what is taken is left to the courts to decide in the future. The litigation that will be engendered by such an assertion by the United States as this resolution calls for will not be ended until long after any war that we may get into will be concluded. The fact that the Attorney General does not proceed to assert the Government's claim without an order from Congress is proof that the Attorney General is not convinced of the legality of the claim."

"The burden is on you and your associates to protect the interests of the people you represent."

After reading your communication I made a brief study of the legislation and found that hearings had been held on this resolution as far back as 1938. The last hearings were held before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the Senate, from March 27 to 30, 1939.

Your rather gratuitous statement, "Without doubt the Navy Department has taken advantage of the present crisis in the war in Europe and has managed to get favorable action on this resolution on the plea that it is necessary for purposes of defense. This is a perfectly absurd assertion to make, as the lands are under the control of the Government whether they are owned by the State or by citizens of the State," does not seem to be justified by the facts. I would like to direct your attention to a letter written under date of February 20, 1939, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by Hon. Charles Edison, Acting Secretary of the Navy, from which I briefly quote:

"My dear Mr. Speaker: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed joint resolution declaring the conservation of petroleum deposits underlying submerged lands adjacent to and along the coast of California, below low-water mark and under the territorial waters of the United States of America, essential for national defense, maintenance of the Navy, and regulation and protection of interstate and foreign commerce reserving the same as a naval petroleum reserve subject to any superior vested right, title, or interest; and authorizing appropriate judicial proceedings to assert, ascertain, establish, and maintain the right and interest of the United States of America in such reserve, and to eject trespassers."

"The purpose of the proposed joint resolution is to conserve the petroleum deposits underlying the bed of the Pacific Ocean off the coast of California below low-water mark and under the territorial waters of the United States of America by reserving and setting aside such deposits as a naval petroleum reserve, subject to any outstanding and lawfully vested adverse right, title, or interest. It involves the assertion of a claim of the right of the Government to conserve the oil in these petroleum deposits for the purposes of national defense, maintenance of the Navy, and regulation and protection of interstate and foreign commerce."

I regret that your opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 92, which in the opinion of well-informed persons here in the Capitol, does not and will not affect the interests of the city of New York or the owners of certain water-front properties, is so violent as to have made it necessary for you to impugn the motive of the Navy Department.

Allow me to assure you that I shall be mindful of the admonition contained in your letter but in voting on Senate Joint Resolution 92, I shall be guided by the views of the Navy Department rather than your opinion.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

[Applause.]

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent Mr. PATMAN was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a letter and resolution which I have today received from the Omaha Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an address made by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, at the World's Fair in New York on last Friday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the South Bend Tribune.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE RELIEF BILL

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this measure as it is presented to the House. It is wrong any way you look at it. The President in his 1941 Budget recommended \$975,650,000 for W. P. A. for the 12 months beginning this July 1. The measure we are now considering proposes the same amount, but it provides it may be spent within a period of 8 months and makes no provision for the other 4 months.

It is assumed the President knew what he was doing when he submitted the Budget. If he now finds that amount insufficient he should come to the Congress with a forthright statement of what is needed for the full 12 months and not resort to this subterfuge.

Everyone knows the other 4 months will have to be provided for. Unquestionably it is the duty of this Congress to make such provision. We are certainly shirking our responsibility. What we are really doing is voting about \$500,000,000 for the last 4 months for W. P. A. and leaving it to an entirely new Congress, and possibly a new administration, to find a way of financing this amount.

The reason for submitting this proposal is, of course, politics. The President is sensitive to the growing criticism of the mounting Federal debt. By this devious device he hopes to avoid some of this criticism. Also, this is an election year.

I submit this is the worst kind of Federal financing. It will injure still further our already sick economy and is unfair to W. P. A. workers themselves.

I do not believe I was sent to Congress to support such a dishonest and unprecedented piece of legislation as this.

What assurance have we that we will not be confronted with similar demands for other agencies and bureaus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein brief correspondence between Mr. Lawrence Fairbank, Mr. Harry S. Barger, and Mr. E. K. Burlew, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a brief editorial from the Pasadena Post of May 17, 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may extend his own remarks and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MITCHELL, for 10 days, on account of important and urgent business.

To Mr. RISK (at the request of Mr. SANDAGER), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. CORBETT), indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREWSTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of The Senate of the following titles:

S. 229. An act to authorize the withdrawal of national-forest lands for the protection of watersheds from which water is obtained for municipalities, and for other purposes;

S. 1214. An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes;

S. 3402. An act to authorize the granting of a right-of-way for roadway purposes on the Fort Thomas Military Reservation, Ky., in exchange for the release of property rights in and to a certain road on said reservation; and

S. 3423. An act to increase the number of brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army by four.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 24, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Friday, May 24, 1940, at 10 a. m.

Business to be considered: To continue hearings on S. 280 and H. R. 145—motion pictures. The opposition will be heard.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on Friday, May 24, 1940, at 10 a. m., at which time the committee will consider the subject of maritime unemployment insurance.

COMMITTEE ON WAR CLAIMS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on War Claims on Monday, May 27, 1940, at 10 a. m., in the committee

room—228 House Office Building—for a hearing on S. 3097, for the relief of Katherine M. Drier.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be held before subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary a hearing on H. R. 8963, to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act (to include chiropractic practitioners). The hearing will be held at 10 a. m. Monday, May 27, 1940, in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, room 247, House Office Building, Tuesday, May 28, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of considering H. R. 9149, entitled "A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled 'An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian Wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes.'"

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1673. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 4008 of the Revised Statutes affecting mails destined to foreign ports; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1674. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the payment of damages to Emory Poulson or his heirs and the acquisition of an easement over certain of his land which may be flooded in future through the operation of the Fort Hall irrigation project, in Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9848. A bill to authorize the construction or acquisition of naval aircraft, the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9791. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Select Committee on Government Organization. House Joint Resolution 551. Joint resolution providing for the taking effect of Reorganization Plan No. V; without amendment (Rept. No. 2269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7658. A bill to provide for the protection and preservation of domestic sources of iron and steel; with amendment (Rept. No. 2270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHURCH: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9296. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Springfield, Ill., September 8 to 13, inclusive, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 2272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Texas: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 9859. A bill providing a time limit for collection of feed and seed loans; with amendment (Rept. No. 2273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9719. A bill to prohibit the sale in the District of Columbia of products of convict labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 9651. A bill for the relief of Meier Langermann, his wife, Friederike, and son, Joseph; without amendment (Rept. No. 2271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 9873. A bill to provide in Boston Harbor, Mass., a sea-plane channel in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 9874. A bill to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or in any national park or forest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan:

H. R. 9875. A bill to provide that payments made to States or Territories to aid in the maintenance of disabled veterans in State or Territorial homes shall be used solely for such purpose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 9876 (by request). A bill to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H. R. 9877. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate and to put into effect charges for electrical energy generated at Boulder Dam, providing for the application of revenues from said project, authorizing the operation of the Boulder power plant by the United States directly or through agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. DIES:

H. Res. 499. Resolution to authorize the payment of expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 321; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 9878. A bill for the relief of Searle Sales & Service Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 9879. A bill for the relief of the Brownstein-Louis Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 552. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present the Distinguished Service Medal to Maj. Gen. David L. Stone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8393. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the International Institute of Boston, Inc., Boston, Mass., opposing the passage of any antialien bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8394. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition submitted by A. M. Mohr, of Dryden, N. Y., and signed by 200 residents of Cortland County, favoring House bill 8264; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8395. By Mr. JOHNS: Petition of W. I. Wagener and 24 other citizens of Sawyer and Sturgeon Bay, Wis., asking support to the Federal chain-store tax bill (H. R. 1), that it may be speedily enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8396. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of Effie Mallory and 108 other citizens of Admire, Kans., on behalf of House bill 8264; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8397. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the New Jersey Department, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, urging that an adequate defense, sufficient to resist all possible invasion from foreign countries, be maintained, and asking support of the President's program of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8398. By Mr. SWEENEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Cuyahoga County, State of Ohio, urging enactment of House bills 7646 and 3649, and hearings by the Post Office and Post Roads Committee; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8399. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, Local 1421, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a bill to deport Harry Bridges; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8400. Also, petition of District No. 2, United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

8401. Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, American Federation of Labor, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the omnibus transportation bill of Senators WHEELER and LEA; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8402. Also, petition of Chevy Local No. 668, United Automobile Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Saginaw, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8403. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Local 85, Racine, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8404. Also, petition of the International Workers Order, Branch 3506, Calumet City, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the antialien bills, to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8405. Also, petition of the Pullman Porters and Maids Protective Association, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9406, concerning the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8406. Also, petition of the Railroad News, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9406, concerning the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8407. Also, petition of the Washington Industrial Union Council, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8408. Also, petition of the Young People's Religious Union, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 7534, concerning the poll-tax restrictions in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8409. Also, petition of the Young People's Religious Union, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Federal antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8410. Also, petition of the Young Women's Christian Association, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antialien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8411. Also, petition of the International Union, Dodge Local No. 3, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antialien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8412. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Dodge Local No. 3, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8413. Also, petition of Martin J. Gillen, of Land O'Lakes, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the disastrous effect on a financial break-down of our railway systems in relation to our national defense; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 24, 1940

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 24, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art ever nigh, unto whom Thy children flee for succor, we humbly beseech Thee for all sorts and conditions of men, that Thou wouldst be pleased to make Thy ways known unto them, Thy saving health unto all nations.

For the youth of our country we implore Thy guidance and direction, and, as they enter the opening doors of opportunity, eager for the challenging experiences of life, do Thou set for them great tasks, giving them of Thy strength, that, as citizens of our Republic, they may reach the goal of high achievement.

Again we pray for those who have tried and failed, to whom the meridian of life brings naught but discouragement. Do Thou take their broken lives into Thy mending hands, and give them the rehabilitation and comfort of Thy beneficence.

And so, dear Lord, we commit ourselves and our sin-stained world to Thy tender care. Grant that holiness and purity, truth and patience, daring and tenderness, hope and faith may once more be enshrined in the hearts and lives of men as the constant and pervading things in our humanity, as veritable harbingers of peace.

We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, May 23, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calhoun, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 544) making appropriations for work relief and relief, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 255. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the port of Cascade Locks, Oreg., certain lands for municipal purposes; and

S. 1214. An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.